HFM

H.F.M.

1924 1927

Vol 58-A

58A

1924-1927

H.F.M

Hindu Vol 58

1924-27

File No. 16 to 19

pp 34-40
69-80
146-147


செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர்

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள்
March 2005

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள்
July 2005

சரிபார்க்கும்
மு.நி.பா.எ.
கையொப்பம்

[illegible] பதிவு

இவ்விதழில் உள்ள H. Fm. Vol 58 ஐ செப்பனிட்டு
தேவையான பராமரிப்பு வேலை செய்த பொழுது
அந்நூலின் பக்கங்களில் 1924 முதல் 35, 48, 49, 1710, 1712, 1722 ~~2192~~ மற்றும்
2192 முதல் 2194, 2234, 2235 ~~மற்றும்~~ 2272 முதல் 79 மற்றும்
2384, 88, 92, 96 ஆகிய பக்கங்கள் இல்லை.
என்று தெரிந்து கொண்டோம். இப்புத்தகம் மிகவும்
பழுதடைந்து காணப்பட்டதால் ~~[illegible]~~ பக்கங்கள் இல்லை
என்பதை அறிய முடிந்தது. செப்பனிட்டு
[illegible] PR I வேலை [illegible]
[illegible] பரிந்துரை

[signature]
22/3/05

[signature]
22/3/05

C✓ F. Leh. 16. 1 3 1616

LEADER

From the Hindu dated 2nd January 1924:-- (Hindu-1924)

## THE COCANADA CONGRESS.

After two long years of barren controversy, the Congress has at last settled down to a programme of active work. This indeed is a welcome gain; and Cocanada, and the Andhradesa generally, may well congratulate themselves on the fact that it was amidst their hospitable surroundings and patriotic atmosphere that one of the most successful sessions of the Congress in recent years had its inspiration and its being. The leaders depart from Cocanada, not indeed with a record of solid work accomplished, but certainly buoyed up with that hope and cheerfu determination without which no solid work is possible. Unity in Congress ranks is an accomplished fact and room is left for none to grumble that the path of his "party" is beset with the thorns bestrewn thereon by the members of the "other group". Henceforth, if the leaders fail to show a record of work creditable to themselves and to the country at large, the fault shall not be because "Congress did not give a clear lead". For the Congress HAS given such a lead in the resolutions passed by it at Cocanada. It has decided that quite but none theless substantial work shall be the programme for the country-- a programme made the more easy and capable of intensive fulfilment because it permits of concentration on one or two essential The Congress will in future, have "men, money and munitions"-- those triple requirements on which success so largely depends. The khaddar Board has been reorganised and placed on a sound footing, financial as well as otherwise, and it should be poss for the Board so to extend and organise its work as to permeate the economic life of the nation as a whole from one end of the country to another. In the volunteer organisation, which ~~the~~ also the Cocanada Congress has brought into being the Khaddar Board, as indeed, the Congress as a whole, has an auxiliary of no small value. To organise and control a volunteer force is not an easy matter; for, in the matter of recruitment and training as well as in that of defining its scope and activities and providing for its discipline, the leaders will find no easy

4

task, and if the task be satisfactorily accomplished, that by itself, would be no inconsiderable gain. ~~Inare~~ Intensive prosecution of the constructive programme is thus the main work that the Congress has resolved on for the forthcoming year. The other resolutions such as the one relating to Satyagraha are purely subsidiary. The Congress will exclusively ~~puruse~~ pursue the constructive programme, but this it has decided to pursue at all costs. That is to say, if in the prosecution thereof Government hamper its workers by denying them their elementary rights as citizens, then, it is provided that the Working Committee, sitting as the Civil Disobedience Committee, shall consider and decide if and when Civil Disobedience ~~Committee~~ is to be offered. The latter weapon is not to be thus resorted to in any light-hearted manner but purely as a last defensive measure and not as yet part of a general offensive to secure SWARAJ. The Congress this year discussed a few other subjects as well. Of course, the resolution relating to the position of Indians abroad, is among the most poignant feelings ~~the~~ which our slavery gives rise to; and the fact that the Congress has had to rest content with expressing mere "sympathy" with our brethren abroad, much as a starving mother, with an empty pocket, has to be content with shedding tender tears at the sight of her hungering children, is one which more than overfills our cup of bitter humiliation. All that we may now do with effect is to stop all emigration from India so as not to expose a wider front to those who attack our status and our civilisation and the Congress has rightly asked a Committee to explore all possibilities of restricting and, if possible, of wholly discontinuing emigration. The Congress at Cocanada has thus had a strenuous time; and if it had not much in it that is of spectacular value to its credit, it may yet feel gratified that it accomplished something more substantial by once again laying those foundations of Congress activities which had grown rather shaky through 2 years of quarrelsome and almost contemptuous neglect.

5 3 1620

LEADER

FROM THE HINDU DATED 3rd JANUARY 1924:-

A Straight Document.

"We deny from the standpoint of efficiency or character an essential European element is necessary in any of the civil services and we do not except from this category even the so-called 'security services'.

These trenchant observations are made in the course of an exhaustive and closely reasoned memorandum presented to the Lee Commission to-day by the Indian Officers' Association of the Presidency. A few sentences later we read: "We can understand the candid argument that India is politically subordinate to England and that therefore she must submit to a number of lucrative posts being reserved for Englishmen. But it is adding insult to injury if such reservation is accompanied by the assertion that Indians are unfit for such posts----------- The political effect of reservation will thus be disastrous and INDIA CAN HARDLY BE EXPECTED AT THIS STAGE OF HER POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT, TO ACCEPT MEMBERSHIP OF ONLY SECOND CLASS SERVICES FOR HER SONS IN THEIR OWN COUNTRY". The point of approach of the services question by the Indian Officers of this Presidency at any rate will thus be seen to be not quite dissimilar to that of the general Indian public. And if there is a combative tone about this ~~xxxx~~ memorandum, the European membess of the services have themselves to blame. They sowed the wind and now have to reap the whirlwind in the shape of a bitter and acrimonious controversy running on racial lines. When the reader looks carefully through the evidence so far tendered before the commission at Allahabad and again at Bombay, the play of clannishness and violent trade unionism, the half-expressed contempt for the Indian officers, the openly expressed distrust of the ministers and the Government of India, the reckless disregard of the interests of the tax-payer, he will realise not only that the trodden worm turns, but that in the name of ordinary self-respect it ought to turn. With refreshing frankness and

with no mincing of words the Madras Indian officers hold that the All-India service was "primarily a device for excluding the Indian" from the highest posts in the services. "Thanks to Mr. Montagu" they continue, "the Indian element promises to be a growing one until the proportion rises to 50%; and nor unnaturally the European oligarchy in the All-India services, is feeling very anxious over the unwelcome prospect. The old device has broken down; in the present political condition it is impossible either to abolish recruitment in India or to prevent the migration to England of Indians competitors. Camoflouging will no longer pay and the European servants of Government have been obliged to lay their cards on the table. Finding that indirect and round-about methods of restricting the number of Indian entrants to these services are proving ineffective, they are proposing a more direct method and suggesting the division of the All-India services into two racial categories--European and Indian--and the reservation of the most lucrative posts for the European section"! No self-respecting Indian, they declare, can agree to these suggestions, least of all an Indian officer. It is indubitable that the trend of European evidence has rendered it necessary for the Indian officers in this Presidency to controvert the very serious allegations that have been made against them, that have been adjudicated upon EXPARTE and on the basis whereof has been raised a whole edifice of reorganisation of the services. Beginning with their own interpretation of the term "increasing association of Indians " in the preamble to the Act of 1919, they state in their memorandum that Madras has demonstrated that she is quite ripe for full provincial autonomy. They advocate, therefore, the immediate unification of the provincial and the All-India services. They point out the anomaly that the agency on which the PROVINCIAL executive has to rely for the administration of PROVINCIAL subjects should itself be a central subject. The All-India mask only enables the services "to claim to be appointed controlled and dismissed by an extra-provincial authority and

5 7 1624

to escape effective control either by the provincial executive and the provincial legislature." They point out how the present anomalous state of things is not only a violation of the spirit of the Act of 1919, but should render the adequate, efficient discharge of their duties by the Ministers or members of Council impossible. Complete provincialisation and unification of the services connotes the transfer of control from the Secretary of State to the local Government and wholly untenable differentiation into superior and lower service, which at present obtains. Complete provincialisation, it may be argued, might tend to disparity between provinces as regards scales of pay and prospects. It is an open question whether this is entirely a disadvantage. It might lead to the regulation of salaries on a more economic basis and is in any case preferable to setting up a sort of uniform minimum wage based on monetary value of the services xxxx not of the worst but of the best servants with something added for various intangible sacrifices. Refering to a x hackneyed cry whose staleness in its greatest danger, the memorandum scathingly remarks, "the theory that members of the All-Indian Service when discharging these so-called duties of a lower order are only under training is a mere pretence. Taking the I.C.S. for an example, it has been calculated that under present conditions it takes from 18 to 20 years' service for an I.C.S. officer to get confirmed as a Collector. The proposition that the duties which an officer is called upon to discharge for nearly two-thirds of his total service are only a part of the training for fitting him for the remaining third of his career has only to be stated to express its hollowness; it is tenable only in the sense x that in a permanent service every step in the official ladder furnishes training and experience for the next step." Therefore they advocate the policy of equal pay for equal responsibility, the officers being borne on the same list and promoted on the principle of worth after trial in service. The pay of such a unified service, it is proposed, x

should be on the Indian basis and such as to attract competent Indians of the required qualifications. The Association will allow Europeans entering the service on the same pay and would deny them even overseas allowances, as they hold "the giving of such allowance will only perpetuate the present disparity in status between Europeans and Indians, and retard the pace of Indianisation". The present scales of pay of the various provincial services are considered adequate and only slight alterations are advocated as will be necessitated by the amalgamation of the services. On the question of amalgamation, the Association advocates the construction of an independent public services Commission for the provinces, as is contemplated for the whole of India in S.96.C of the Act of 1919. The Indian officers' Association is further of opinion that the leave rules should be so modified as to make no distinction between European and Indian. As things stand, they say, I.C.S. officers are entitled to a much higher scale of pensions than the officers of other All-India services.

It is difficult enough to justify this disparity. There is no case for any increase of pensions for the I.C.S. officer. In regard to posts of an exceptional or technical character, the Association advocates recruitment in Europe through the High Commissioner for India, but not until attempts have been made in India to find Indians possessing the required European qualifications and training and it is found that such men are not forthcoming in this country. They agree that the rights and reasonable expectations of existing members of the All-India services--both Indian and European--should not in any manner be prejudicially affected by the adoption of the proposals they have made. Now this scheme of a single provincialised service recruited locally will raise the cry of the "British character" of the administration being in danger. It will also be urged that no English recruits will be forthcoming. On this point the Association is emphatic. The smallness of English recruits does not fill them with any apprehensions for the future. If by "British character"

of the administration is meant good government the Indian officers say it is by no means a British characteristic. In words of vital importance, in view of the cry raised by the services, that their Indian collegaues are making quite a little hel for them, the Association state:--

"While we shall always welcome Europeans as our colleagues in the various services, we must emphatically repudiate any claim that the European as such is superior to the Indian either in efficiency or character. We would add that every European who will serve India in the right spirit and help her to achieve at an early date full responsible government and REAL equality with the other nations of the Empire is welcome". The Association is equally emphatic in protesting against the mischievous and clamorous agitation for proportionate pensions and other reliefs, based upon a generously classic interpretation of "existing and accruing rights". They scathingly expose the demand for secretary of State's control and contingent guarantees. Apart from the inherent objectionableness of the proposals, there is nothing to warrant the belief that the services will be treated other than fairly by the provincial executive or legislature. They expose in vigorousness the travesty of all sound principles in the present position of the services whereby they dictate as well to their superiors-- a position, which, they think, has not been changed by the Reforms. They show up the untenable claims for proportionate pensions by drawing attention to an aspect of the problem that, so far as we know, has not been sufficiently if at all, appreciated. Thus in their general memorandum they say:--
"If a European officer finds himself unable on conscientious grounds to carry out duties which in the interests of the country are laid on him by a European member of the Executive council because in the officer's opinion the policy is un-Indian would for equally valid reasons, be entitled to a similar concession And between the two the noneffective charges will increase in amount, and the only person who will suffer will be the Indian tax-payer. A serious claim for compensation for political

changes made by a body permanent civil servants in this country far from provoking ribald visibility is seriously listened to and elevated into an accepted canon. And yet how ridiculous would be a claim by, say, the permanent civil servants of Britain for compensation against the advent of a Labour Government sound! And yet vested interests stand to suffer far more in the latter case than in the former.

For an explanation of this apparent incongruity we have to fall back upon the "good old rule, the simple plan" which we need not particularise. Rarely has logical or practical Nemesis been so completely shown to overtake the claim for proportionate pensions for European officers.

11 9 1632

LEADER

From the Hindu dated 12th January 1924:-

UNFAIR METHODS.

The Lee Commission surely the most superfluous of all inflictions in the way of public inquiries has concluded its sittings in Madras and for this belief the public will be duly thankful. It is not too much to say that its methods of work are at least as dubious as the motives that gave it birth. Lord Lee perhaps was quite sincere when he declared that he started on his work with an open mind, but either he has been badly served or he is unfortunate in the extent of his capacity for being misunderstood. We have referred before to the trend of his cross-examination which often irresitibly gave the impression that he was mentally forming his conclusions and only wished to give them the backing of evidence. That impression becomes even more pronounced when one considers the manner in which the evidence called before the commission has been manipulated. The commission has perhaps cruelly, but naturally, in view of the circumstances of its inception, been called the "Blackmail commission". The quaint nature of its methods certainly give colourable support to that description. It may be granted that the time at its disposal is limited and that it was anxious to obtrude its unwelcome presence for as short a space of time as possible. Nevertheless no commission can adopt its methods and yet retain a reputation for impartiality. We do not know about the other provinces but in Madras at any rate the selection and handling of witnesses have gone a long way to discredit any of those predetermined conclusions which the Commission appears to regard as implicitly included in its terms of reference. That is especially the case with regard to where the point of view of the general public is concerned. There has not been a single public body which the Commission thought worth consulting on questions which after all may be supposed to be of some concern to the general public. European officers have been asked to state what they wanted and Indian officers have

been permitted to air their views on Indianisation with a freedom strictly tempered by presidential rebukes. But outside of officialdom, the choice of witnesses becomes absolutely ludicrous. The non-Brahmins who worked the Reforms for the past 3 years and may be expected to throw some light on the relation between the Reforms and the services, have been treated with cold contempt. We publish elsewhere a letter from Mr.A.Ramaswami Mudaliar which serves to show the extremely cavalier manner in which a man who has a right to be otherwise than as an unwelcome intruder into sacred ground, has been deprived of his opportunity to give evidence. Even more strange is the treatment meted out to Sir T.Sadasiva Iyer. He was one of those invited to answer the questionnaire and sent in his answers as early as the 26th November last. He was invited to offer himself for examination on the 8th of this month but subsequently received the intimation published elsewhere which in the circumstances can only be regarded as insulting. When one considers that the commission found time to examine not only that shining light of moderatism Sir P.S.Sivaswami Iyer but also representatives of the depressed classes, whom not all the kindly solicitude of Lord Lee could save from making themselves supremely ridiculous, one begins to have suspicions as to whether these errors of omission and commission are entirely fortuitous. One has only to read Sir T.Sadasiva Iyer's answers to the questionnaire to perceive, as through a glass darkly, why even his eminence could not protect him from humiliation. He was dangerous because his views were incompatible with the conclusions that the commission meant to arrive at. Similarly Sir P.S.Sivaswami Iyer was chosen because he was comparatively more harmless. The comedy of the depressed classed evidence was played for reasons which ought to be obvious to the meanest intelligence. Vain is the net set in sight of the bird, doubly vain when the bird has all along been sceptical of the kindly intentions of its would be benefactor.

13 11 1636

LEADER

From the Hindu dated 1st February 1924:--

## The Viceroy's Speech.

By one of those pleasant fictions, which constant iterat tion has converted into a convention, Lord Reading is a Viceroy xx whose ardent liberalism was hitherto cramped by the reactionary tutelage of Whitehall. It is certainly not his fault, that this illusion, so dear to Liberal hearts, has not been earlier dispelled for he has made it clear that his Indian policy was his own and not dictated from above. Now that the demon of reaction has been exercised from Whitehall, and a party of large-hearted idealists is in power, the Liberals would naturally have expected from his latest utterance some generous gesture of reconciliation to the Indian people. With too fond a faith in the irredeemable post--obits that Labour in the wilderness was so prodigal of, they expected the accession of that party to office usher in the millennium, what time the Viceroy unfolded his cramped wings and soared, in the idealistic conditions of British politics, to the highest flights of liberalism. Mr.Macdonald's minatory message has come as a cold douche on one set of hopes. Mr.Thomas's saponaceous speech has left them at the pliability of the Labour party's principles, while the Viceroy's frigid speech has left them but the coldest of comforts to gather to their chilled but eternally hopeful bosoms. To the public at large more interested in the things that he did not say than in those that he did, the most important omission would appear to be the absence of any reference to Mahatma Gandhi. By one of those happy accidents which Providence interposes for the furtherance of human brotherhood, the courage, skill and sympathy of one Englishman, supplemented by an unlooked for considerateness of treatment towards the Mahatma on the part of the Bombay Government has touched the imagination and appealed to the generous instincts of the people. Had the Viceroy chosen to take advantage of that opportunity, as it was well within his power to do, he would have done far more for that app rapprochement with Mr.Macdonald in the intervals of truculent warnings, pleads for, than by any number of

conciliatory speeches,. But the opportunity has gone and we are instead asked to applaud the inhibitory virtues of the Viceroy in the following passage:--"In addressing myself to the internal affairs of India I would remind you that a change of Government has happened in England within the last few days. Ordinary courtesy and also constitutional propriety render it incumbent upon me to refrain from some observations on some Indian affairs I should otherwise be tempted to make until there has been opportunity for discussion with the new Secretary of State and His Majesty's Government. If therefore, contrary to your expectation, I do not express myself upon some matters, you will understand the reason." So much for what he did not say. As for the things he said taking them in due order we may make a passing reference to Anglo-Afghan relations. It is reassuring to hear that these relations have not been put to any appreciable strain but the blusterous attitude of the British press and of certain Anglo-Indian journal certainly gave colour to apprehensions in that respect. Turning next to the position of Indians overseas, the Viceroy can handly expect India to be satisfied with the small concessions that he has managed to obtain and will expect the Viceroy to do the utmost to secure that early reopening to the whole question to which the Labour party stands pledged. To do the late Government justice it appears during its last hours to have developed some remnant of conscience and to have recognized the dishonesty of the Draft Immigration Ordinance. The two points on which the Viceroy dwelt with some emphasis are the measures to deal with anarchical crime and the situation in regard to the Reforms. Concerning the first it cannot be said that his confession of faith was entirely unnecessary. "Need I assert that it was only with great reluctance that I assented to the use of these measures for the protection of the public and in the public interest. I am firmly impressed by the consideration that it is essential strictly to confine to extreme cases of emergency and I fully appreciate and sympathise with the views of those who wish to protect the liberty of the subjects with strict

exactitude." Lord Reading then goes on to add:--"In these days, the strong light of publicity, both in the Legislature and the Press, is brought to bear upon the use of emergency measures of this character and this in itself acts as a safeguard against their abuse." One rubs one's eyes as one reads this assertion. How often has the strong light of publicity led to the righting of judicial wrongs and how often has the Government respected the force of public opinion in such matters? The campaign of repression with its concomitant tragedies such as that of Pandit Vajpai may be left to supply the answer.

Nor is Lord Reading's defence of extra-judicial and preventive action any more convincing. Its evils are, as he acknowledges, great. Its necessity must therefore be most firmly established and its action circumscribed by adequate safeguards. It can in no case be a substitute for a public trial. If it is objected to public trials that witnesses are intimidated it is difficult to see why an organisation with whose every detail Government is familiar, with whose every activity it is perfectly conversant, cannot by the ordinary process of law be rendered too harmless to do further mischief. Where evidence is based on secret denunciations, without the accused being allowed an opportunity of knowing not merely of who accuses him but what is a he is accused of, not the most impartial of judges, not even the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England can come to conclusions which can be regarded as unimpugnable. Turning to the Reforms question it may not be entirely fanciful to suggest that herein one missess the stridency of his earlier warning. It may be that he is now as then challenging the "brave music of a DISTANT drum" for the hour of his trial is upon him. That may have impelled his emphatic assurance that the British nation stands committed to the Reforms as "the rock-foundation of the British policy in India. And optimists will see a hint of good times to come and find in the statement that "(British) Governments may and doubtless always will vary as regards details of administration and may differ in opinion

regarding the stages of progression and periods of advance", a significance all its own in view of the advent of the Labour Government. The Viceroy goes on to repeat his earlier warning of which repetition has served to rob its pristine terrors. In the case of the Central Provinces and perhaps ~~thxxBengx~~ of Bengal he assured his local Governments of his full support, an assurance surely as needless as an encouragement to these as it must be ineffective as a warning to their opponents. It is conceivable that these last do not profess the same veneration for the Reforms that Lord Reading cherishes. One would not wish to be unjust to Lord Reading. He is obviously finding his feet under new conditions. His mind has so often been made up for him that he finds it difficult to say anything till he knows where the Labour Government stands. Meanwhile, the same outworn shibboleths, the same benevolent platitudes, the same terrifying bogies, the same pathetic appeals to "reason and justice" are being trotted out to frighten into conciliatoriness an Assembly less anxious to earn viceregal encomiums than its predecessor.

February 2, 1924.. **LEADER**

## Prison and Paradise.

In a note on "Bombay Jails, their function and administration", the Bombay Government have attempted to paint their prisons as a sort of earthly paradise. The following paragraph from the note is a fair sample of this self-complacent heraldry:

" ............. the prisons in India and especially in Bombay Presidency, have features which are infinitely preferable to European prisons. The whole environment is more cheerful and open and natural. The convict does not spend years of imprisonment surrounded by cheerless bricks and mortar, his sole glimpse of the outside world the sky that roofs the exercise courtyard. Once inside the gates the Indian prison is more like a hospital or a cantonement. ........."

The Visapur Jail scandal and other little things have conspired to tell a thoroughly different story about Bombay prisons, but without going to recapitulate them we shall for the present quote a few lines from the Report of the Jail Committee issued so recently as 1920. Says the Committee "The Common Prison of Bombay is a collection of very old and unsuitable buildings which though long condemned still remain in use. The total accommodation exclusive of the hospital is for 162 while the average during the 10 years preceding 1918 has been 382 exclusive of sick in hospital. The highest population in any one day was 795............Other prisons show similar features. In the Yerrawada Central Jail the accommodation exclusive of hospital is for 1,324, while the average population during the 10 years ending 1918, exclusive of sick, has been 1,638". This extract of course refers to only one aspect of jail life in Bombay, but it is enough to expose the elysial conditions of existence set forth by the Bombay

18 16 1646



Government, for, overcrowding as the Jails Committee has observed produces bad results in food, sanitation, workshop convenience and all other directions and also "upsets discipline, breaks down classification and generally makes the rule of the Jail Code impossible of observance". It is too late in the day to cover up holes by glaring advertisement.

Much human inhumanity can do to make life in jails wretched which has been done in India; and, if trees, shrubs and the blue sky remain to cheer up the prisoners as the Bombay Government triumphantly remark, it is because some portions of bounteous nature still remain undestroyed in India. As to other amenities of jails in India we have but to point out the innumerable cases of men coming out from them half dead with disease or almost brutalised by the weaning influences employed within the bars. To quote the Jails Committee again "Indian prison administration ................has failed to regard the prisoner as an individual and has conceived of him rather as a unit in the jail administrative machinery. It has a little lost sight of the effect which humanising and civilising influences might have had in the mind of the individual prisoner.........The whole point of view needs to be altered, not merely isolated details; and we would add that the primary duty of keeping people out of prison, if it can possibly be done needs to be more clearly recognised by all authorities, and not least, by courts". We would ask the writer of the picturesque description of the Bombay jail to consider and state who speaks the truth--his branch of the Government or the branch represented by the Jail Committee?

--:O:--

19 17 1648

LEADER

From the Hindu dated 23rd February 1924:--

The Happenings at Jaito

The grave developments at Jaito, news from which place is alarmingly scanty are not calculated to smoothen the embarrassments of the Government. Thanks presumably to a vigorous censorship which x keeps Jaito isolated from the rest of the world, we do not yet know what exactly happened at that unfortunate spot. The official communique is woefully cryptic. It does not state how the crisis originated, much less how it deepened into a bloody affair. Nor is it possible to gather from it what exactly is the extent of loss of life and limb. One telegram says that the number of dead is 14, while another estimates it 10; one communique suggests that the crowd was fired at xxx twice, while another averts that it was fired at only once; an official account seeks to make out that a fully-armed army of 6000 Akalis, using not only lathies and Chavies, but also fire-arms defied lawful authority in a menacing manner, while the non-official version, such as is available, does not give any indication that the crowd that gathered round the jatha was not the ordinary sort of crowd that always gathers to a novel sight which the advance of a nonviolent force of 500 pious jathadars provided, ready, if necessary, to face death in discharging what they consider is their duty. This serious discrepancy in the accounts is xxxxxxx disquieting, especially as we gather the authorities had made full preparations to meet any contingency and as we do not know how many rounds were fired and whether machine guns and other weapons were used. If firing on any serious scale has been resorted to, the casualties might easily be many times more than those reported, for, it is admitted that the crowd was no less than 6000, strong. Whatever that be, we are afraid, it is the case that the authorities at Jaito have been guilty of serious mishandling of a delicate situation. They cannot plead that they were faced with a sudden development. They had notice of the jatha's starting days before the jatha actually started. And

then between the starting of the jatha and its arrival at Jaito, more than a week intervened. It seems they had taken sufficient military precautions to deal with any development. But it is significant that they took no preventive measures. The crowds that gave occasion to the firing were not composed of jathadars, nor, it appears, were they outsiders. If they were a militant gang of outsiders, it does little credit to the watchful and almost panickly guardians of law and order in the place that they at all allowed them to muster into a menacing mob. In the circumstances, the theory that the crowd was fired at because it could not be otherwise dealt with cannot be accepted without scrutiny. What happened may well have been that the crowd did not clear off in a military fashion that it was not as instantaneously responsive to the call of the administrators "to form fours and quick march" as a well-disciplined army would be to the command of its general. How exactly the administrator, acted, what warning he gave to the crowd and the exact time for it to act in accordance therewith are particulars which are material in coming to conclusions as to whether the dispersal by firing was justified or not. More serious than all is the fact that the public are kept absolutely in the dark about the exact situation. The Press is not allowed the necessary facilities to keep the public in touch with the developments. An American journalist, who cannot be prejudiced in favour of the Akalis, was on the spot, but he was turned out. He was not even a Hearst Press man. Publicists who seek to go to the spot to get first-hand information are straightway arrested if they are well-known public leaders or unceremoniously turned out if they are men philanthropically inclined or visit the spot in public interest. The arrest of Dr.Kichlew and Mr.Gidwani shows the way in which the authorities tackle the situation. Equally significant is the manner in which Messrs.Shanmugham Chettiar and Lala Hansraj were warned off the precincts of the Nabha State without the least consideration for the fact that they went there from

Delhi, at considerable personal inconvenience, as members of the Legislative Assembly and while the Assembly ~~and while the Assembly~~ is in session. All these people went to the spot on a perfectly peaceful mission and none of them disguised his intentions. They were not rowdies out to create trouble, but responsible men, all of them, whose motives none could challenge and whose ability to contribute to the easing of the situation but few will deny. Yet such has been the height to which official highhandedness has been allowed to soar in Nabha--they were peremptorily denied an opportunity to carry out their mission. More than five months have elapsed since the aspect of the Sikh question now under notice developed. Yet the Government have done nothing to solve it. Responsible Akalists have made it clear that what they ask for is merely the redressing of a religious gr~~e~~ievance. Surely, if Government were more responsive to public opinion, they would not have allowed it to develop into the proportions which it has now attained. The delay has caused mental and physical distress to many thousands of Sikhs. Indeed, the whole Sikh community is in ferment could this state of things be any longer allowed to continue?

LEADER

From the Hindu dated 25th February 1924:--

THE MODERATES' MOVE.

The moderates' new organisation, the National Conference, concluded its proceedings at Delhi on Satuday. A summary of the proceedings of the conference will be found elsewhere. It is unfortunate that a Conference with so resonant a title could not escape from the suspicion of being a hole-and-corner affair designed no doubt primarily in the national interest but tending in some measure at least to the greater glorification of Mrs.Besant. That apart, it is satisfactory to know from these proceedings that, however defective they are, they are not such as calculated to encourage Government in what Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru called their policy of "immobility". For neither the resolutions of the Conference nor the speeches made there at are calculated to please the bureaucrats. Far from the Haileyan pill having satisfied them, this assemblage of "enlightened constitutionalists" as they wish them to be considered almost accepted the view that the Government of India Act was no good, even if it was not a camouflage. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, in his concluding remarks, referred to the cynical quibbles of his "late colleague" sir Malcolm Hailey only to repudiate them. The latter's attempt to draw a distinction between Dominion Status and responsible Government an attempt which recalls to mind Lord Curzon's interpretation of the Queen's Proclamation, drew forth a mild suggestion, from Sir Tej Bahadur that such an attempt was disingenuous and unworthy of a great Government. Nor did liberal leaders fail to see through the other arguments such as those relating to the Indianisation of the services and the communal question. The speeches, in short, left no room for doubt as to what the Liberal attitude is in this matter. The Liberals solidly stand for SWARAJ as do the rest of India. Their resolution demands immediate responsible government at the centre as well as in the provinces. They are, it is true, prepared to make certain reservations in regard to the former. They would, in regard to foreign relations, be content with mere influence where

others demand power. That reservation they make to placate interests which they wish to carry with them. It is a reservation which we think is absolutely unnecessary from any point of view. No Indian Government however popular it be, would be foolish enough to disregard the advice of its military experts so that the reservation is hardly called for from the point of view of safety. It is not the case that Indians Politicians are a bare-brained lot who only wait for power to enable them to disband the army, and scrap the equipment. They may not be prepared to shoulder what is purely an imperial burden, but they know the defence needs of the country better than to embark on suicidal schemes of retrenchment. There is no need therefore to keep the national defence a reserved subject. In fact, such a reservation may even provide a vexations irritant by precipitating frequent dead locks in the legislature. The need of the hour is not restrictions and reservations but the realisation, on all hands, of the fact that the best cure for all difficulties is to implicitly trust the people. The Liberals, we dare say, realise it, but unfortunately hesitate to follow up their intellectual convictions by such actions as their logical implications involve. That has been in most cases the bane of their politics in the past, and that, unfortunately has not ceased to be the case to-day. They still cherish a pious faith in the deputations, a faith doubtless revived by the advent of Labour to power. Reason cannot dissuade them from it and they must therefore perforce be left to be taught by experience.

22

1658

24

LEADER

From the Hindu dated 28th February 1924:-

The Need for Enquiry.

That not alone the Sikh community but almost every section of the people has been stirred to the depths by the shocking tragedy at Jaito our telegraphic columns bear evidence. From the multipdicity of statements it is somewhat hard to find out the real inwardness of the happenings there on that unhappy day. A rigorous censorship has been practised at Jaito, as we said, at the time; and men suspected of no designs on the administration of the Nabha state, but who went there as independent enquirers into the situation were incontinently bundled out of the state by the fiat of the civilian administrator. In these circumstances it is fairly impossible to apportion blame as between the jathas and Government. Elsewhere, to-day appear a statement of a responsible sikh member of the Assembly, passed by the Censor, and another statement by three eye-witnesses of the occurrence, wired out by our special correspondent. Considering the standing of the individuals it is hardly possible to withhold credence from their statements. But as against the cryptic messages issued under official imprimature at Delhi there is a world of difference ~~xx~~ in their story of the ruthless doings at Jaito. Without bias in favour of any preconceived theory, it seems fairly obvious that there was no provocation for the firing and that it is a trifle hard of explanation why such firing should have been indiscriminate, and should have been resorted to thrice in the course of a few short minutes. Neither is it easy to conceive why ~~xxx~~ cavalry should have given chase to the crowd. Allegations of a more serious character are also made; and the eye-witnesses, Professors of the Khalsa College, state that the crowd was unarmed. Even if an all-knowing Government might have ready explanations for these discrepancies between the non-official and the official accounts, we dare say it will not be equally easy to explain why the medical comforts section of the Jatha should

have been so summarily treated. Look at it how we may, the case for an impartial, non-official enquiry is considerably strengthened. It may not be superflous xx to point out that this view finds an unexpected supporter in Lord Curzon. In our latest telegrams yesterday would have been seen his Lordship's opinion that h the record of the Sikhs forbids any suspicion of their being ever disloyal and that some serious misunderstanding must be at the bottom of this transformation of a religious movement into a political one--though he went at the deep end in connecting the movement with unheard of things.

MARCH 17, 1924.

SEPARATION OF ~~POWERS~~: Powers

The Report of the Coleridge Committee on the separation of the judicial and executive functions together with the comments of the Government thereon was laid on the table of the Madras Legislative Council at 2 P.M. to-day. The Committee are for maintaining the STATUS QUO except in regard to the magistracy from the District Magistrate downwards. As for the latter they propose the setting up of two parallel sets of magistrates, one performing purely executive functions under Chapters VIII ~~and~~ to XII of the Criminal Procedure Code, for the mintenance of public peace and safety, and the other purely judicial functions of hearing and deciding cases. In the case of the former the Collector- District Magistrate will be in control,(~~they suggest, is to be exercised~~) while in that of the latter, the control, they suggest is to be exercised by the High Court through the sessions Judge working through an Additonal District Magistrate. The Committee opine that by increasing the jurisdiction of the present officers work may be so distributed as least to increase the cost of reform. The Government have thrown overboard all the recommendations of the Committee-- not very liberal recommendations by the way--and advocated a scheme which they maintain <u>does</u> in practice give us all we wish for or ought to wish for. Separation is impossible financially, administratively and otherwise. Even if it were financially possible, it would lower the prestige of the District Officer. He would be unable to command respect, enforce order and collect revenues unless he were something like omnipotence incarnate in all the 3 fields of revenue,collection, maintenance of peace, and the administration of criminal justice. That is to say he

must enjoy some sort at least of control over life and limb as well as over the property of the citizen if he is to function efficiently! The only concession that Government are prepared to offer is to make the machinery of criminal administration more efficient both by improving its personnel and by relieving the latter of revenue work by some process of division of labour. They are also prepared to exploit suitable honarary agencies as fully as possible. In short, they offer to improve their systme of <u>droit administratif</u> they will in no way do away with the systme itself. The Govermment's summary of the Committee's proposals and their own counter scheme will be found everywhere, detailed comment on both of which we have for the present to defer.

-------------

MARCH 25TH, 1924.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

The Law Member's statement in the Council yesterday regarding the Government's attitude on the separation of the executive and judicial functions deserves some notice. Personally neither he nor the Local Government for that matter were against any reasonable reform in regard to this affair. But there were the Secretary of State and the Government of India to be reckoned with; and the Local Government had practically been ordered not to give way to any proposals the legislature may insist on, but keep themselves in readiness to carry out the instructions which were in the process of formulation, by the Secretary of State. One fails to see what these instructions are and for what purpose that meddling official at Whitehall is taking upon himself an onerous task which is fully within the sphere of the Local Government. The Secretary of State's decision and the Government of India's obliging intercession on his behalf wihout even as much as raising a mild protest against his act throw yet another flood of light on the ways of Whitehall. For what exact purposes the Secretary of State has interposed his veto befehand, we are not definitely told. Only one reason clearly emerges and that is that the question has to be dealt with from the point of view of the services as well as from other points of view. Is it the case that the Lee Commission has recommended that recruits to the Civil Service will not be forthcoming unless they were guaranteed full magisterial powers over the people? Does it find that the status and prestige of the service, two essential

things, are dependent on the retention of its judicial powers and must not in any way be interfered with? The Law Member's statement in fact raises a question of 1st class importance. That question is: Are the elementary rights of the citizen to be at the mercy of the local bureaucrat in every district by allowing him to be at once the prosecutor and the judge? This is apart from the indignity that has been offered to the Council through the local Government to be the slave of Whitehall? The Council at any rate has refused to accept that status by carrying a motion against the Government. But in doing this we are afraid it has not gone as far as it should have done. Its motion simply amounts to accepting the recommendations in the Majority Report of the Coleridge Committee. Those recommendations do not certainly give us all that we want. Such wide powers as those contained in Chapters VIII to XII of the Cr. P. C. are still to vest in the Executive through abuse of which they could harass the citizens and mock at the liberty of the subject. We have had too much experience of the use to which the Executive put these preventive sections to let it continue to enjoy them without adequate safeguards. The Majority Report does not divest them of those quasi-judicial powers on which the course of regualr judicial trial so largely depends, namely, magisterial enquiry. The Executive will still control many of the essential preliminaries to the trial and exercise considerable influence on the course of trial. The only thing the

recommendations deprive the Executive ~~mf~~ is the final judicial proceeding of trial. It is this modest scheme that the Government refused to accept and it is only this scheme which, by defeating the Government yesterday over the vote for Criminal justice, the Council accepted.

31

MARCH 29, 1924.

## SATYAGRAHA IN KERALA.

The proposal for Satyagraha by the unapproachavles of Kerala and the contemplated prohibition of the same by the Travancore Government have served to stimulate the interest and attention of all India leaders on the evils rampant in that hot-bed of untouchability. We published a few days ago the message of Mahatmaji warning the Congressmen of the province of the need for caution and absolute non-violence in the conduct of the struggle and wishing them God-speed in its progress. Today we publish on another page the appeaos which Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Swami Shraddanand have sent to the Thiyyas (an obviously mistaken generalisation for the whole class of untouchables) on hearing about the proposed Satyagraha. Malaviaji has counselled patience and it is for workers on the spot to decide whether the present is the best time for launching on the campaign, whether all the conditions laid down by Mahatmaji for such a struggle have beenfulfilled and whether the untouchable masses of the place are prepared to endure all suffering peacefully both at the hnads of the official authorities and the ignorant, orthodox high castes. The Kerala leaders for one thing should not precipitate action because of any short-sighted or provoking orders of prohibition which the Travancore Government may choose to pass. The success of the struggle depends not upon any vain spirit of bravado, but upon the silent preparation and solid organisation behind the campaign ensuing non-violence and the enlistment of the sympathy of the disinterested public. It must be borne in mind that the

evil is rampant in Kerala as in mo other part of the country and that it has the support behind it of age-long tradition, as well as an intricte andhighly reactionary system of caste, orthodoxy and religious superstition. . . . . . . . . . Congress leaders in Kerala cannot afford to forfeit by any hasty action the sympathy and active help of this wide and influential public.

31

1676

APRIL 1ST, 1924:-

33

In an interview which Reuter summarises to-day, General smuts has given what we should call a frank explanation of the Class Areas Bill. He told Mrs. Naidu that the Bill was necessary because "There was an rugent need to relieve the acute tension of feeling and prejudice in the country". It amounts to a confession that he is yelding to the megaphonic clamour of the Anti-Asiatics who are possessed by unreasoning hatred. That is honest enough, but why does General Smuts pretend again that the Bill is intended solely for enabling the Indians to "live and thrive" in their adopted home? If you now heed the cry to shut up Indians in a perpetual quarantine, to-morrow the self-same people may demand the deportation or decimation of all Indians and contrive to create the same "tension of feeling and prejudice in the country. India indeed has grounds to fear that segregation is only the 1st step towards compulsory repatriation. General smuts is silent on this point but he is committed by implication "to relieve the tension" all along the line. It is therefore a little disingenous to seek to claim for the Bill the backfound of good will it soes not possess and we are left none the better by the honeyed words of General Smuts,

----------------

32

34.

1628

APRIL 3, 1924.

For all much vaunted "sympathy" with Indian aspirations the Labour Government has not yet been able to get out of the rut which its Diehard predecessor left it as its legacy. There is, for instance, the question of Indian members on the India Council. Under the Montagu regime three members were appointed to the council. It is now long since two of them resigned. They did not presumably wish to fill them up with Indians. But they dared not return to the old state of things when the Council was the monpoly of the sundried bureaucrate. But the Labour Government surely is not faced with such difficulties. The Council may contain 8 to 12 memebrs of which half at least may be Indians, though it is doubtful if even Labour would contemplate such a substantial Indian strength on the Council with equanimity.

If this anti-deluvian body must remain, it is but fair that Indian opinion should be substantially represented on it, that is, according to the theory propounded by the framers of the Reformed constitution. The Joint Committee assigned an imporant place to the council. "They think", run a paragraph in the report, "that at any rate for some time to come, it will be absoutely necessary tht the Secretary of State should be advised by persons of Indain experience. They think also that its constitution may be advantageously modified by the intorduction of more Indians into it and by shortening the period of the service upon it, in order to secure a continuous flow of fresh experience from India". The intention of these reccommendations of the Joint Committee was thus first to increase the strength of India n representation and secondly to see that the representation is such

that it ensures contact between the Secretary of State and the prevailing Indian opinion for the time being. Mr. Montagu increased the number of Indian members to three, but he was scarcely happy in the choice of the personnel. The consideration which appears to weigh with the Secretary of State in making these appointments seems to be that of the degree of support that he would get from the prospective member for any policy that he may decide upon. Far from being India's representatives they tend to be the Secretaryof State's man , i.e. if they are not the burecrate's representatives. If Labour is eranest about India's demands, it is possible for it to make the Council not entirely an unmixed evil.

36.

1682

APRIL 4, 1924.

# CLASS AREAS BILL

The steam_roler of oppression which is euphemistically called the Class Aread Bill is well on its way to the appointed task. The second reading of the Bill began in the Union Assembly the day before yesterday and the acclamations greeting the speech of Mr. Duncan, the Minister for Interior leave no doubt whether the Bill will be passed. Mr. Duncan ended his speech with an emphatic declaration that the South African Government is determined to carry the Bill regarless alike of opposition in the union and of retaliation from without. Nothing seems to have been weighed with the Union Government as against the clamour of the anti-Asiatics and the question naturally arises as to what the Government of India have done by way of protest and remonstrance. Have the Government made a sufficiently strong representation? On the 19th of March, the Council of State recored a resolution asking the Government to take effective steps to prevent the passage of the segregation bill. The attitude of the Government then was luke-warm and attuned to the melody of the sweet reasonableness to the extent of affirming that " the heart of Sourth Africa was sound. Have the Government taken any more steps to protect the Indians who are in South Africa? We hope they have. That the Bill has come up for second reading despite all the protests of the Indian community here and in South Africa has to be taken as the measure of the India Government's action. Whomsoever we might blame the gruesome fact stares us in the face that the Bill is rushing to become law and will mean thebeginning of a

movement to crush out the Indian. The tamper of White South Africa may well be gauged from the almost brutal downrightness with which Mr. Duncan exposes the objects and provisions of the Bill. There is not even a pretnce of tenderness. It is owned with unabashed forankness that the Bill is intended only against the Indian Community and that it is necessary for no other reason than that the South African finds the Indian a skilful competitor. The Minister speaks in half-tones of contempt when he refers to the Gandhi Smuts agreemtnt and lays down, with supercilious sapeicne, that the vested interests referred to by Mahatmaji in the agreement "were purely a side issue". The Minister however knows that the course towhich he has set his hand is unwarranted by the law even as it stands. . . .. After this it must be assumed that, as Mahatmaji warned us last month, "the Bill in question connotes not only segregation but direct expusion". If an Indian is to be penalised simply for being efficient and skilful, tere is o reason why the pwer tha can do it should stop at segregation and not proceed to expusion; and the South African Whiteman easily goes to the extreme. But Mr. Duncan does not choose toleave us in doubt. He deliberately asserts that the policy of making Indians return from South Africa shouldbe "developed and extended". That is to say, beside the measure intended to help Indians " to live and thrive" in carefully selcted areas, the insidious process of repatriation will be put towork. That is plainness with a vengeance. There can be no more doubts about the danger that hangs low over

38 36 1686



the heads of our brethren in South Africa. There is no longer room for the facile optimism which Sir B. N. Sarma showed and preached in the council of State. Our countrymen certainly cannot submit to an enactment which threatens to weed them out by slow attrition. India must wake up to the fact that a fresh crisis of severe trail is developing and to delayin making her voice effective would amount to a betrayal.

-------------------

APRIL 7, 1924.

News comes from CAWNPORE of a Mill strike with an ugly sequel. The official communique published elsewhere gives a long story of incidents justifying the firing on the crowd by the police, but nothing is said about the genesis or the progress of the dispute in the mill. It can h ardly be that such a crisis as is desrribed in the communique should have developed all on a sudden as if by magic. We are told little about what preceded the events of the day when firing took place. Nor is light thrown on any attempt at settling the dispute by arbitration. Cawnpore is a place uncommonly fecund instrikes and in view of this fact its well-wishers of industry might well have established a permanent organisation to tackle labour disputes. Strikes of course are best when avoided but when do occur a more tactful way of dealing with them than that adopted at Cawnpore should be devised. Both in the interests of industry and in those of humanity it is desirable to find out a method of setling labour disputes in a just and peaceful waywithout permitting them to develop into disastrous outbursts.

- - - - - - - - - - -

38

40 1690

APRIL 18, 1924.

TRUTHS ABOUT JAITO

What may be regarded as first-hand testimony in regard tothe Jaito shooting affair is provided in aletter of Mr. Zimand of the "NEW YORK TIMES" which we reprint everywhere. Mr. Zimand, it will e remembered, had the distinctionof being served with a specialorder " to leave both Faridkot and Nabha territories at once". He is an American journalist who came out here for direct news and is free of prejudice against either side. He is a correspondent of acknowledged integrity and standing and in addition the factthat he represents not the yellow Press but an eminently respectable and conservtive journal precludes the idea of dismissing him as a cheap sensation-monger. He has interviewed officals from the Viceroy downwards and non-officials from Mahatmaji downwards. Hence the remarkable value of the statemens he has recorded in this farewell letter to Mahatmaji explaining the events as he saw them. The point which he emphasises with repeated stress is that the crowd was absolutelyunarmed. We have been told in the official communique issued soon after the event, that the crowd had equipped itself withfire-arms and lathies, and the statement is iterated, though withless certainty in the report of the make-believe official enquiry. But Mr. Zimand affirms with emphasis that : "I had the opportunity of observing pratically the entire jatha and the crowds accompanying the jatha; I did not see any one carrying firearms or any other weapons". That was just a little before the actualoccurrence and at the place where the jatha were encamped but even when the fateful procession began soon after, the vow of non-violence appears to have been

scrupulously kept. "The whole procession" writes Mr. Zimand, "passed in front of me and again I saw no carrying firearms or weapons of anykind". Mr. Zimand returns again to this subject before he ends his letter and records that "I observed carefully the jatha and the crowes folly the jatha from Feb 20th 7P.M. till Feb 21st 2 P.M. when they entered the Nabha terrotory and that to the best of my knowledge the jata and the crowds folly the jatha were not armed and behaved in a peaceful and orderly manner". To those who compare the sincerity of this averment with the laboured attempt of the enquiring note toinfer infer the presence of firearms it will not take much time to feel where the truth lies.

To pass to another point in Mr. Zimand's letter his story of the happenings makes itdobtful whether the previous warnin said tohave been given to the jatha was actually conveyed. The Order of the Administrator to the jatha was handed over by an officer to Dr. Kichlew and he and Mr. Gidwani answered theofficer " that the paper wasnot menat for them because theydid nt belong to the jata". What the officer did next his not known, but it would appear that the warning ordr intended to thejatha was not conveyed to them. "No officail presented them the paper from the Administerator which was handed over to Dr, Kichlew. In fact by the time there were no officials at the frontier." How does this assertion compare with thestatements in the official communiques to th effect that timely and suitable warning was given?

One can hardly help feeling that the official version of the events has had a good deal to rely on evasion or prevarication. To take yet another point from Mr. Zimand's letter, Mr. Gidwani's arrest and detention on which we commented the other day appears to have been a penalty on his humanitarian impulses. Writes Mr. Zimand: " A short time after the 2nd firing a young chap brought the news that there were many deaths and casualities and said that no arrangement had been made to take care of the wounded. It was at this stage that Dr. Kichlew and Mr. Gidwani decided to motor to Jaito in order that they might take care of the wounded". Up to the moment of this information Mr. Gidwani had no intention of going to Jaito and Mr. Zimand is convinced that had it not been for this appeal in the heart, Mr. Gidwani would not have entered the State. It is this man who went there because he could not bear to think of the wounded being left uncared for. It is this man that is arrested and detained without trial or conviction. Is humanity then to be crime according to the new Nabha code? Can it be pretended that in the face of these facts the new regime in Nabha is more endurable than that of the Maharajah who is alledged to have woefully misgoverned the State? All that Mr. Zimand has said strengthens the apprehension of the public that full facts about the tragedy and the subsequent events are not yet known. The hasty on-sided enquiry held by the Magistrate has not satisfied the public and it behoves the Government in view of the facts affirmed by Mr. Zimand, toinstitute a fresh and exhaustive enquiry into the whloe affair.

APRIL 24, 1924.

EYEWASH

The announ ement is made to-day that Sord Reading has appointed a committtee in connection with the departmental enquiry regarding the reforms. The very fact that Government are not over anxious toadvertise the personnel and procedure of the Committee is suspicious. We do not know what exactly will be the reaction of the Liberals to this move on the part of the Government. One thing however we do know. It is that the Committee has been appointed almost a day after the fair. The Committee cannot have much by way of iniative. The scope of the enquiry and the lines it should take-by no means unimportant factors governing its success- have been practically predetermined for them by others. The dpartmental enquiry has in fact been initiated. The circular to the Local Governments are now with the latter. They are merely to to be a sort of informal jury to deal with evidence placed before them evidence which they shall have few or no means of sfting, evidence which they may be called upon practically to accept as gospel truth. Conclusions are bound to proceed from premises and they shall have no means of testing the soundness or othersiese of the premises. What value can attach to conclusions so arrived at? In these circumstances the question is not simply one of personnel. It is notthe case as some critics suggest, that all will be well if XYZ are appointed to the Committee. Men with the best of visions cannot see things in their true colours if they are compelled to examine them throught coloured spectacles and the procedure adopted by Government imposes a certain

44 42 1698



perversityof vision on the Committee to which the, say they are going to refer the question. Nor, let it be understood, will the positon be bettered if those who were obliged to "work" the refoms and failed and were asked to serve on the committee or otherwise "consulted". The root cause of the failure must be clearly understood before effective remedies therefore can be prescribed. That cause is the incompatibility of the wishes of the electorate with those of the bureacratic executive. The extent of the failure of the reforms would have been greater if theelectorate represented the people adequately. The bureacracy must thank its stars that the electorate is small and the constituencies jerry mandered doubtless to its maximum advantage, but as surely to the maximum disadvantage of the people at large. Nothing less therefore than the reconciliation between public opinion and bureacratic will almost diametrically opposed to it will avail to solve the impasse. Herein lies the folly ofrallying the Moderates. Such rallying can not be conducive to the growth of responsible government is the professed and much-advertised goal of the Government! There is only one way to get out of the difficulty one method whereby the reforms may be made a success, whether the Government are or are not prepared to accept it. That wayis to rally the people as a whole and not any section, community or individuals thereof. But are Government prepared to do this? Not yet. It is the task of the leaders and the country as a whole to compel them to do so.

- - - - - - - - -

43

1700

APRIL 25, 1924.

## THE REFORMS COMMITTEE AGAIN

It is somewhat hard to reconcile the method adopted by the Government of India in pursuing their departmental enquiry into the working of the constitution with the almost definite promise held out by the Premiere in his York speech about consulting Indian opinion. The "Englishman" quick to scent the least concession to India's just demands protested against such inconsiderate statements as might serve to raise impossible anticipations in the Indian mind. But here is the operative portion of the Premier's speech, from the fuller version supplied in a special cable to the "Forward"

"An enquiry is being held by the Indian Government We mean to be serious. We do not mean to be an expedient for wasting or losing time. We mean that an enquiry will be held to produce results which will be the basis for consideration of the Indian constitution, its working and possibilities in which we hope to have Indian co-operation on the journey to creation of a system which will be self-governing. We shall see everybody who had valuable things to say to us and our ears are open to the representatives of any body of people elected to public authority by votes of Indian electors. We are constitutionalists throughout. The suggestion that men and women chosen by the Indian people to speak their mind and speak on their behalf are not to be consulted by us, we should never entertain for a single moment". Now it is for the Premier to

46 44 1762



decide how far the above unequivocal oral decłaration is borne out by the actualsteps taken by the Government here. We expressed our opinion of their move yesterday. Lest, however, we be charge with an irresponsible desire to blast the fame of the bureacracy, we wouldfain add that a calcutta correspondent of a Ceylon contemporary used words which might lead one to infer that non-official Indians have been addressed onthis subject. Should this be the truth it may bring some balm to lacer ted Moderate hearts. The question then arises: "Why should the Indian Government blush toinform us of the fact? The truth is, one has to conclude, the Government of India are afraid of the possibilities of an enquiry, of even thiskind and would prefer the ways that are dark. And in these devius ways they have right trustworthycounsellors to support them. We leave aside the European Association which under its new auspices is beating its wings in feverish anxiety. The "PIONEER" WX with the inborn instinct of the tribe for whom it caters, has been expatiating on theneed for a "definite statement that in no circumstance will the Act come up for revision before the end of the statutoryperod. What our Allahabad well-wisherhas expressed in words of great directness, Lord Meston has mildly paragraphed for thebehalf of English leaders. A heresy that has nine lives is not easily killed and the reader will see for himself through all the laboriously marshalled statemens about sacredotalreactionaryism in Indian politics. In the face of these facts and if the Premier of England couldnot bring the Indian Government to honour his avowal, he can hoardly have any complaint

47 45



1704

against this country if it refuses to go the whole length in placing implicit faith in his Government. The only course open then to our moderate friends is to recognise the logic of facts. Their faith in the Premier and his party, however justifiable, is not and probably will not be enough to deliver the goods in this country. The Government of India has demonstrated that naught but unrelenting opposition of the united countrywill move them. Will Indian Liberalism hearken?

46

48

1706

MAY 2, 1924

There are few more iniquitous chapters in the annals of bureacratic India than the one which deals with the trade in opium. By a strange turisting of governmental wisdom the procuring of revenue has been considered a higher object than the stoppage of the vice and India still continues to supply the horrible drug to thousands of people at home and aabroad who use it, not soley or mainly for medicinal purposes, butmostly to intoxicate themselves. All the world is now up against the traffic in this poison but the Government of India alone wants to persist in it. Under the auspices of the League of Nations a great international effort was made 2 years ago to get the traffic stopped once for all, but the Indian offical representative secured a reservation so that India might not lose her revenue. Thus while all countries seek to restrict the use of opium strictly to "medicinalor scientific" purposes, India alone would have it for all "legitimate " purposes, which phrase, one must take it, covers the use of the drug as an intoxicant. It is time that the people of India register their emphatic protest against this reservation and join the universal drive towards prohibition. Mr. Andrews' articles on the subject, one of which we publish to-day, must waken our legislators at Simla who have a grave responsibility in this respect to see that India is not let down at the next meeting of the Opium Convention in November.

- - - - - - - -

47

49 1708

MAY 7, 1924.

ANTI-DRINK CAMPAIGN

GOVERNMENT'S HOSTILE ATTITUDE

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, writes from Salem under date May 6 :-

Akkarapatti and thehamlets around, thanks to the vigorous social reform work of the Kongu Vellala community have abolished drink, but the Government system cannot accommodate itself to this. Its rules and conditions, its penalties and fines, whatever their originalobjects might have been are so unsuited to an awakened and active social conscience that theywork unmitigated evil in the new state of things.

The sales went downto almost nothing for some months and the renter in deeence to the wishes of the people of the locality closed the shop and requested the authorities to permit this step. All classes including the panchamas joined in this voluntary scheme of abolition-indeed, there were possibly a few stray cases among the upper castes, but the Panchamas were most vigourous in their campaign against drink. The renter's petition to Government was however of no avail. The Abkari officers charged him with the Offence of not keeping his toddy shop open. ' I shall pay you your rent, what else do you claim'? asked the Renter. 'We shall pay the whole year's stipulated Drink profit, what more canyou want', asked the village -folk and subscribed the amount at once. But the rules contemplated no such reform and provided noway out of the difficulty. The officers could only read and apply the rules!

58

50

MAY 23, 1924.

1714

THE PREMIER ON INDIA

The place and space given to India by the Premier in his speech at York, a report of which is extracted ~~every~~ else-where from an index of the nature and extent of the interest taken by the Labour Party in the affairs of this country. Towards the close of a long speech answering the charges of inaction against Labour in England after dealing in detail with the problems of housing in England, the Experts' Report and the German situation we find the Premier making a pronouncement regarding India which is as brief as it is vague and cursory. After making the oft-repeated observation that the rejection of the budget in the Assembly was not ~~fiar~~ fair tohim and his colleagues and that Dominion Status is the ideal of the Labour Government for India he said:- "I would say to our Indian friends, 'Do keep your faith in the British democracy, do keep your fait in British Labour Government. An enquiryis being held by the Indian Government. Now, we mean that enquiry to be a serious one, we don't mean it to be an expedient for wasting and ~~kesigxkie~~ losing time; we mean that enquiry to produce results which will be thebasis of the consideration of the Indian Constitution, its working and its possibilities, in which we hope we shall have Indian co-operation on thejourney on the creation of a system which will be self-governing'". The appeal to keep up faith inthe Labour Party, we may point out comes withill-grace from one who has failed so far to show anysigns of translating his words into action and to prove himself tobe of a different

order, so far as India is concerned from his predecessors in the Imperial Parliament. The grguments advanced by the friends of labour in this countryin defence of its poor performance and failure to do justice to this country is that labour is only in office but not in power. They ask us to remember labour's manifold difficulties and sympathise with the Cabinet for its anamalous position in Parliament as the maxx head of a minority party. But the Premier in his speech, it will be observed,has directly challenged this dictum of beinginoffice with ut powerxx and defied the charge in a triumphant spirit enumerating the various achievements of the party so far. He has observed rightl, that "whoever is in office has oppurtunity and oppurtunityis power". We are not told howeverby the Premier that he has made any reservtions in his mind regarding labour's opputtunity to do good to India or its capacity to carry its ideals into action in regard to Imperial problems. In the absence of any such reservations therefore, the Premier's answer to the cahrge of being in office without power should be takento apply to the Indian problem as well. Thus the speech of the Premier falisifies the arguments of his friends in this country and we have to attribute Labour's failure to do justice to India and fulfil its own professions to causes other than their inability or want of power. It mayb be an unwillingness caused by a sub-conscious taint of Imperialism in labur's blood or a fear to offend the Imperial instincts of the British nation and die-hards in Parliament. To trace the causes of this

nervousness we may have to go farther into the philosophy of political idealism than we can here afford. Another point to be takennote of in the Premier's pronouncements is his reference to the objects of the committee now at work in Simla enquiring into the Reforms Act. If the Premier's words are given their full import the scope fo the enquiry should be much wider than it is officially given out tobe. According to the Premier, it is to be a serious one to produce results which will be a basis of the consideration of the Indian constitution, its working and itspossibilities for the creation of a system which will be self-governing. But the official report of the scope of the Simla Committee does not promise any such thing and we wonder why or how such a disparity of purpsoe has been allowed to creep in. Is it, we ask another case of Simla over-riding White-hall, or the latter bending to the will of the former?

-- - - - - - -

53

53 1970

MAY 15, 1924.

'Much ado about nothing' was the judgement passed by European District Magistrate of Ballia in the de~~f~~a~~f~~mation case brought by an Indian against an European opium agent. The particulars of the case are extracted elsewhere and it will be seen how grossly unfair is the attitude of the Magistrate and with what a light conscinece he has discharged his duties as a judge by summarily disposing of the case without even summoning the accuses. We are not sure that the Magistrate would have done the same thing if the parties in thecase have changed positions and the Indian stood as an accused before him charged by the European for defamation. But more than the unfair disposal of the case what debases justice and detracts from the dignity of the judgment is the reason attributed by the Magistrate for the dismissal of the case. He says:- "This indeed is a case of much ado about nothing. The language does not insult thecomplainant but the user". There are, we mayconcede, certain words which insult theose who utter them more then those against whom they are flung. But, we mayadd, such words, are generally to be found only in the dictionaryof defamation.

-------------********----------

54

1724

MAY 24, 1924.

REFORMS ENQUIRY "CONCESSIONS"

The announcement regarding the further stage in the reforms enquiry which is made in a press communique to-day takes us little further than where we are. There is little disposition disclosed in it to yield to public pressure. There are but two points in the communique which, superficially looked at, would appear to bea concession to the public agitation. One is in regard to the association of non-officials in this country and the other the power of the committee to "receive written representations, and if necessary, to hear oral explanations upon them" Neither of these however is a new concession. The promise to associate non-officials with the enquiry was made long ago by the Premier and also the Secretary of State. We in India know full well the qualifications with which this promise was made. We were distinctly told that the representatives constituted would not be men who sought to wreck the reforms. In other words, it was only the king's friends-- or rather the bureacracy's friends, as we may put it here- that were tobe consulted. Whatever that be and whoever be chosen, Simla is not the authority which will do anything calculated to lay the axe at the root of its own power. If the association of non-officials is not a new thingneithr is the readiness to receive representations of a gesture of peace. Sir Malcolm was magnanimous enoughg to promise in the Assembly, in the course of the

56

1726

55 

debate on the subjeet, the Government would not shut out advice from which ever quarter it came. It was a perfectly innocuous promise and it cost nothing at all to theburea-cracy. Indeed, it was wholly superflouous. There are the petition rules under whic any man might have represented his views to Simla and whitehall. The question was: Will the advice be effective and there Sir Malcolm Hailey and his collegues on the Government of India preferred to keep their own counsels. There was the fist rub The present announcement has not taken us further than that promise.

However apparently wide the scope of the enquiry, it is narrowed down by the objective of the enquiry, which is the thing that matters. And the scope of the proposed enquiry far from being comprehensive is exceedingly narrow. It is perhaps also worthy of note that there is in the terms of reference no menti n at all about the Central Government. To place a cut and dried bureacratic scheme and secure approval for it at the hands of a committee composed of a few confirmed moderates or colourless ploticians is probably to smoothen the ruffled plumes of the British Cabinet. It is certainly not tosatisfy India.

-----------

57

MAY 27, 1924. 56. 1728

The Lee Report

The Report of the Lee Commission is now published. The text of this document is not yet aviable, but the recommendations therein, judging from the summary, are so disappointing that we are surprised to find that the Indian members of the Commission are signatories to it. It will take some time to envisage with perfect accuracy the full effect of the Lee recommendations. It seems, however, clear that by this document the Services gain practically everything that they wished to gain. A brake is to be applied on the process of Indiansisation after the 50% stage after 15 years, whichis grudginly provided for, is reached; The Services' demands for increased pay and pensions are substantially met. Provision for medical treatment for the whites by the whites is amply made, the tax-payer bring obliged to bear the travelling expenses for the doctor's or the patient's itinery, as the case may be.

Passage money for the European servants is to be paid on fixed scales. Princely provision is made forexchange compensation. This compensation is commuted on the most favourable terms to the services. The servant's overseas pay is to be paid in England at the rate of two shillings per rupee. This is to be paid irrespective of the fact whether exchange is high or low and that at the extremely high and fictitious rate of two shillings per rupee. That is to say, every rupee of the Euroepean servants' overseas pay is to be considered 8 d. more valuable than the Indians rupee. He is to be placated by other

other undertakings as well. There are to be guarantees about his pensions and other emoluments of various kinds such as the provident fund family pension fund and so on.

Nor is it enough to look to his physical and financial well-being. His status must be maintained. He is to be made immune from the control or supervision of the Indian Minister except of his own choice. He will be judged, if not by his peers, only by a special superior tribunal, the public services Commission. Not that he will necesarily accept the latter's verdict. He may challenge it, if he so wished, before the GOVERNOR GENERAL in Council andneed not acquiesce in any body's verdict except that of the Secretary of State in Council. The European servant is to be xx a servant but in name, so far, at any rate, as the transferred depts and the Ministers are concerned. Expert that he claims to be, he is to be the sole judge of his own work, and worth, and xxx his sphere the Ministers must approach with bated b/reath and whispering humbleness. The dyarchy in the xxxxxxxxxxx Constitution in so far as dyarchy is a fact is to have its full reflection in the organisation, recruitment and control of the services. That is to say, there is to be a species of dyarchyin regard to the services as well. The Members of the Services xx are to besplit into those attched to the Reserved Half and those attached to the Tansferred Half. The latter are tobe subject to the c ontol of the Local Governments with the advice of the permanent Services

Commission. The present incumbents, however, holding appoin-xyxmkx tments in the transferred sphere are to be fully prosected in the enjoyment of their existing rights. Recruitment in the future for the I.C.S. is not, however, to be made separately for the Transferred and Reserved Departments. When, therefore, an I.C.S. is not, however, to be made separately for the Transferred and Reserved Departments. When, therefore, an I.C.S. Officer is allotted to the Transferred Departments, he is to beallowed the option of retirement or other compensiation. This is making service in the Transferred sphere a PARIAH service in advance and it is astonishing the Indian members acquiesced in this recommendation.

The Lee solution of a dyarchy in the services even if it were possible to make the dyarchy effective by limiting the powers of the Governor to usurp the Ministers' powers-- is beset with other difficulties as well. For one thing, so long as the present system of administration remains the fact has to be faced of the anomaly which Prof. Coupland refers to of divided control obtaining at present in regard to the Services and of the same officer being subject to both the reserved and tansferred depts, in as much as his functions comprise both reserved and transferred subjects. Nor can the circumstance be ignored that work for the enfored 50% Euroepan servants cannot be found wholly in the Reserved Departments. Thus a certain number of European officials will have to reamin idle or be imposed on the Transferred Departments. This will specially be the case even if what is contemplated in regard to

constitutional advance is along the Montford lines of increasing the transferred subjects. But waht we want is immediate responsible government; and if the Lee recommendations are accepted theywillconstitute --such are the contractual obligations they impose on us either a severe drain on our financial resources or a serious stumbling block on the path of India's constitutional advance. For it is no use blinking the fact that the financial obligations they impose on us may largelyexceed the Commission's estimate and, even if they do not, a crore and a half of rupees is no inconsiderable sum for us with a budget which, truly speaking has notbeeen balanced for some years past. The recommendations we are afraid, will if accepted, seriously jeopardise the futre progress of India. From the financial point of view they are deplorably disastrous from the administrative point of view they are dangerously anomalous; while from the constitutional point of view they are claculated to stifle India's progress towards Swaraj. In the circumstances, it will be suicidal if it is suggested in any quarterthat India approves of them. The Commission's suggestion that the recognition of their recommendations should be reinforced by the conduct of a stulitfying propaganda in the British Universities is a significantly sinistermove. India cannot be a party to such a begging campaign. If the existing members of the services could not get on without the social pleasure which a continuous stream of British recruits to the services assures to them, well, it is their business to advertise their glories and the opportunities for humble and honest service in India on such terms as India is able to offer.

JUNE 2ND 1924. 60 1736

## HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

We extract ~~everywhere~~ else where the full text of Mahatma Gandhi's statement on the vexed question of Hindu-Muslim unity. It is a masterly exposition of the whole problem in the cahrac-teristically clear and frank manner of the Mahatma. He holds that there is no more important or pressing problem for solution before us than this at present reiterates his conviction that the atainment of Swaraj is impossible in this afflicted counry without the fomation of a lasting heart-unity between the Hindus and Mussalmans. Of these two communities, he says, the key to the solution lies with the Hindus, as the majority, and asks them to purge their hearts and their society of the cancerous vices of fear and distrust which poision their whole attitude towards the Muslims. "We must shed timidity or cowardice. We must be brave enough to trust, and all will be well". With these remarkable words which breathe an undying faith in human nature and which ought to inspire courage and trust into the hearts of every patriotic Indian, Mahatmaji concludes his statement and they contain the spirit and substance of Mahatmaji's solution for the sore problem. Cynics may laugh at the simple and purely psycologic nature of the remedy suggested by Mahatmaji for what others have tried to cure by pacts and political settlements. But some serious thought and a careful study of the Mahatma's statement will suffice to show that pacts and other solutions are possible to be worked out in a proper atmosphere when the hearts of the two parties have been set right and instilled with a genuine feeling of friendship and desire

for settlement, Mahatmaji does not however belittle the value of pacts. The condemnation that he makes in this connection of thebully and the coward in both the communities is remarkable for its high moral fervour and righteous indignation and we wish the well-deserved chastisement sink deep into the hearts of persons of both the communities. In Mahatmaji's opinion, one of the primary causes of the whole trouble is the loss of faith in non-violence among the thinking sections of both Hindus andMuslims. Unless this faith is regained, he says, the solution will be as distant and difficult as ever. For,he says:- "in my opinion an attitude of non-violence in our mutual relations is an indispensable condition prior to discussion of the remedies for the removal of the tension. It must be commission cause between the two communities that neither party shall take the law into its own hands, but that all points in dispute, wherever and whenever theyarise, shall be decided by reference either to private arbitration or to the law courts if they wish. This is the whole meaning of non-violence, so for a communal matters are concerned. To put it another way, just as we do not break one another's heads in respect of civil matters, so maywe not even in fespect of religious matters. This is the only pact that is immediately necessary between the parties, and I am sure that everything else will follow". Mahatmaji's reference to law courts obviously indictes his appeal is not only to non-co-operators but applies to all sections of our countrymen. We hope his appeal will not go in vain.

63

JUNE 2, 1924.

62

1740

The stike fever of the fire-men in certain sections of the South Indaan Railway is just perhaps abating. Into the rights and wrongs of the causes of the strike, it is not for us now to go; nor are we in possession of the necessary materials to undertake such a task. The strikers allege that they have been unfairly dealt with, while the Agent, on the otherhand, suggests in a communication which we publishe everywhere, that the present stike is of thekind known as "ligtning strike" which took him altogether unawares. We are not for the moment concerned with an examination of its origin and nature. What we wish to emphasise is that which everparty is in thewrong is doubly in the wrong. For a railway strike is not a matter which affects the emploer and theemployee alone. It affects wider interests. The general public are vitally concerned in the matter andit is due to them that neither the employer nor the employee should suddenly refuse them the transport facilities to which they were accustomed andare entitled to. In Australia, New Zealand and othercountries, sudden cessation of theactiviy of public utility concerns like a railway is prohibited by law, the employer and the employee being bound to refer the disputes between them to an arbitration board by whose decison theymust abide.

- - - - -*- - - - -

64

JUNE 12, 1924. 63 1742

THE "CONSTITUTIONALISTS'" MEMORANDUM

The Joint Memorandum on the Indian Reform question proposed to be presented to the India Office by Mr. Sastri, Mrs. Besant and others on behalf of the Liberals, the National Home Rulers, and indeed, of all "constitutionalists" is a document of some importance. It may not be comparable in all respects to the Memorandum of the Nineteen which preceded the Montagu Reforms, but its significance so far as this country is concerned is as great. From the point of view of the Government, the weight of authority behind it must be considered irresisitible and conclusive; and among the signatories are some of the friends and staunchest supporters of British connection. And what do the leaders of the Moderate school of Indian politics say? They are confident that the continuance of two things on which they set their heart, as well as Englsihmen, namely, the safety of the British connection and the existence of a constitutional party are conditoned by a frank recognition of the realities of the Indian situation and the tackling thereof by the grant of substantial reforms. "The safety of the connection between Britain and India depends," so they firmly believe, "on the establishment of Dominion Home Rule in India as quickly as possible". They go on to point out that if this is not done, India will go the way of the American colonies in the XVIII centrury and of Ireland in the XIX, that in fact, "the constitutional party will be destroyed and people driven to despair". The signatories, we are glad, clearly recognise that India has no use for fair words and beautiful promises calculated only to postpone

the advent of Swaraj. They are fully "convinced that the people of India have no real confidence that Britain will in the near future give effect to her declared intention of establishing Dominion Home Rule in India". "The present unrest", they further say, "will rightly continue until such Home Rule is established". Nor do they fail to emphasise the fact that the demand is not a sectional one but a nation-wide one". "All political parties in India", they point out, "are agreed in demanding Home Rule and differ merely in regard to the ways for attaining it and not with regard to the fundamental principle of India's right to self-Government". They even demand the right to a qualified sort of self-determination, for they claim the initiative in regard to drawing up their own constitution.

In these respects, i.e. in expressing the determination of a United India to gain Dominion Home Rule and to spare no trouble and face any risks in attaining it and in demanding self-deterination, the signatories to the Memorandum under consider tion,are in agreement with the rest of India. When they come to the exact ways in which they say the problem should be solved, difficulies arise. They will be content with provincial autonomy in the provinces and a certain type of Dyarchy in the Central Government, constituted as the provinces at present are and their relations with the Central Government rather ill-defined, it is doubtful if provincial autonomy may be made real without effective popular control over the Central Government. Further, the proposed dyarchy in the central Government is not so easy

~~to work as is imagined by these~~

to work as is imagined by these leaders. To take one instance, defence is to be a reserved subject, but it has been pointed out that a European General Staff may not take the responsibility for defence unless they have control over the Railways, these latter being of strategic importance. So also in the matter of relations with the Indian provinces and foreign affairs. Conflict may arise at many points where the division into transferred and reserved will depend on a line arbitrarily imposed by the Governor General. Nor is the constitutionalists proposal for a RoyalCommission more impressive; but of the dangers of this we have said enough on the previous occasions.

All middle courses, in fact, which are based on the hypothesis that the Indian cannot be trusted, as these divisions into reserved and transferred are, are bound eventually to fail. Two things are indeed fundamental pre-requisites for the success of any reform, first that the aim of Imperial policy in India shouldbe one of exploitation no more in fact than in theory and secondly, there should be complete confidence in the good sense of India on the part of England. That is why Mahatma Gandhi says somuch emphasis on a charge of heart on the part of Britain and on our attaining the ability to refuse tobe exploited by our developing economic self-sufficiency. If the signatories have failed fully to realise these points of view which are the nation's points of view, this performance is yet significant. It has anmy rate served to show to Lord Oliver that India has no use for his " Fabian Policy" and that she rejects with scorn, his advice that we should accept the Fabian way to win Home Rule.

totheir great, though unfortunately short-lived, delight. The Indian members of the Committee, however, got him to admit that if the position of the depressed classes as regards education and official prefermens was bad, it was bad not certainly because of the opposition of thehigher classes and in some cases in spite of their endeavour to ameliorate their condition.

Their quasi-social disabilities remained, but they not seldom remained, Mr. Surve wa forced to admit , because of their owndisinclination to claim and assert the equality of rights offered to them. The trick of exploiting the depressed classes havingthus failed the Anglo-Indian die-hards fell back on the Hindu-Muslim relations as the most serious obstacle on the path of an advance. What the ex-Ministers wanted, theysaid, was Hindu Raj. Such a Raj theysaid, the martial races, Muslims and the Sikhs, would not acquiesce in. Even this delusion theycould not now cherish in the light of Mr. Barkat Ali's evidence which we publish elsewhere. In spite of Sir Alexander Muddiman's efforts, Mr. Barkat Ali firmly stood for self-Government with of course, certainsafeguards forMuslaims. It is noteworthy that Sir Muhammad Shafi elicited, through the witness, the fact that the present Hindu-Muslim tension is accidental and temporary, that the interests of both the communities were essentially identical and that whatever differences there were at present would easily be adjusted erelong on a lasting basis. Is it any wonder, in the face of these facts, that the cry "halt" to the enquiry finds vehement expression in the hostile press?

liquor trade. You should expose the falsehood of these charges, crush the drink faction, and save the Gandhi Flag" This is their appeal. It is difficult to convince a community born and bred up in the law court atmosphere, that it is futile to depend on the administration of law in the Anti-Drink campaign. Mr. M. G. Vasudevayya was with me when some of these men pleaded hard to be permitted to take legal help. He told them, "if you win in defending against these charges, even then your expenses and trouble would be so heavy that your spirit will be broken and you will not take up the challenge again in sheer terror of the trouble it would involve, if you lose, your spirit will be doubly broken. Either way therefore it is suicidal to accept the battle in the law courts". Reformers must make up their minds once for all that to be fined and imprisoned is a part of the Reform process, and take the magisterial persecutions as an inevitable incident in the Campaign and not waste a single thought or anna over them. On the other hand if the siren voice of law be allowed to tempt you away you are atonce lost in the all-absorbinb task how to get acquitted and the main issue is forgotten. I think we have convinced the men. It is clear the people do not want drink. The Government must make its choice, either to summon up courage and help the people in their determination, or to go along the old path of hypocrisy and persecution. The Christian Missionaries, the Temperance Socieities and the Moderate reformers have also to choose whether to stand aloof, or lend a helping hand to those who struggle against the toddy Demonstration. The signs are clear that Alcohol and Authority willjoin and make a frantic use of the Criminal Code and its weapons.

68 69 1752

JUNE 19, 1924.

THE PREMIER ON THE MC CARDIE JUDGMENT

The Premier's statement in the Commons on the issue in the O'Dwyer case, is ingenious. It altogetherignores Mr. Justice Mc Cardie's notorious OBITER DICTA which were uncalled for and which so scandalously prevented justice being done to the defendent. Mr. Ramsay Mac Donald really pursued a side track when he concentrated attenton solely on the verdict of the jury to the exclusion of its antecedent, the judge's outrageous misdirection to the jury which influenced that verdict. The Premier, however, gives some indication of the fact that he is not exactly pleased with the result of the case, especially with the political aspect of it. He is careful entirely to repudiate Mr. Justice Mc. Cardie on his gratituous white-washing remarks on General Dyer. Mr. Mac Donald clearly stated that his Government "agreed with the late Government as regards the judgment passed on his (General Dyer's) action". We are not surprised at this open repudiation of Mr. Mc Cardie's scandalous asseverations. The Labour and theLiberal Press in England whose comments we have been publishing from time to time, are aflame with indignation at the way in which the facts have been marshalled and interpreted and the law laid down by Mr. Mc Cardie. They recognise, however dimly be it, to what a low level British reputation to justice has been reduced by judgments like these based purely on racial and political considerations to the exclusion of judicail ones. How far Mr. Mc Cardie has departed from fairness and from judicial impartiality will further be considered in this country when the text of his charge to the jury is

availabe, but the cabled summary of it has been enough for us to assess the value of "justice" for an Indian in Britain. The Mc Cardie judgment is only a travesty of justice, it is a cruel insut to the nation, coming as it does, at a time when the earlier set of wrongs has not yet been righted. The massacre of hundreds of people simply to create an impression and the heapin of untold humiliation on thousands, women and children incluede, were by themselves intolerable wrongs. To these is now added a fresh insult in the shape of a "judicial" decision glorifying those responsible for it, directly or indirectly, a decison thrown at our face based on the evidence mostly of the perpetrators themselves of those wrongs and without even the show of hearing the other side. A feeble indirect repudiation of so outrageous a national insult can by no menas be an adequate reparation thereof. The heap of the dead and dying Indian innocents, men, women and children, in theblood-flooded Jallianwalla Bagh trap, may not lie within the range of Mr. Mc Cardies vision, or he may hold that such inhuman slaughter is no atrocity, but its spectacle is green to us in India. To condone, much worse, to glorify such an act is simply revolting to us and such feeble and indirect expressions of repudiation of the Mc Cardie view as those of the Premier are but poor consolation tothis long suffering country.

**************

JUNE 30, 1924.

70 71 1756

## UNITY AT LAST

There will be much gnashing of teeth in the r anks of Tuscany over the fact that once again the Congress has survived a crisis which threatened its very existence as a national organisation. It may be safely premised that those severe logicians and stern moralists of the Anglo-Indian and Liberal Press who have pretened to see in Mahatma Gandhi's proposals a Herculean effort at cleansing the Augean stables, were actuated not so much by love of Gandhi as by a desire to see the last of an organisation which persists in surviving their assiduous and uninterrupted efforts at belittlement. To such, as we said, the compromise arrived at between Mahatma Gandhi and the Swarajists, willcome as something of a shock and thepublic may expect to be treated to an exhinition in which will be registered surprise, virtuours indignation and scorn for the pliability of Mahatma Gandhi. They will count it as particularlyungrteful of the latter that in spite of their laudations of his sincerity, and honesty of purpose which show all the brigher in contrast tothe musky atmoshphere in which the Swarajists have their bing, he should so far have belied their expectations as toextend the hand of fellowship to his opponents. To us othes whose views on the eventual outcome are not coloured by similar prepossessions the compromise arrived at represents the only safe and sesible course. It speaks volumes for the statesmanship and amenability to ~~xxxxxxxx~~ reason of the Mahatma that he should so far have consented to recede fromhis orignal position for the sake of the larger interests of the country. He has realised that unity is a commodity for which if it is possible to pay too high a price,

71  1758

it is well worth paying as high a price as one could afford to pay. And we must realise that the Mahatma has paid a price which might cost him somesearchings of heart. It is not necessary here to go into details as to the extent of the compromise and the surrender made by the protagonists in the controversy. The main point tonote is that it has been agreed uponas satisfactory by both parties and that there consequently prevails an atmosphere of amiability which augurs well for the strenuous pursuit of the common programme. It would easy of course to pick holes in the amended resolutions and to point to ambiguities in their language or defects in their logic. We hope no ingenuity will be wasted in this facile but fruitless occupation. That game may be left toour opponents toplay. Their easily shocked sense of the proprieties will find much to cavil at in the proceedings of the A.I.C.C. They will deride the logic of the Committee sitting in judgment onits own competence to decide whether or not the Gandhi resolutios were <u>ultra vires</u> . They might gather some cheap amusements from the constant informal conferences and the intermitten adjournments of the sittings. They mayalso point to the somewhat novel procedure by which a passed resolution wasimmediately rescinded on the ground that had the Swarajists not been absent it could not have been carried. It may for the satisfaction of such critics be readilyadmitted that in these respects the proceedings fell short of thebest accepted standards of procedure. But there are occasions when a coach-and -four have to be driven through the conventions and if on the present occasion a Cromwellian

contempt for them was in evidence it wil find its justification in the logic of necesity. The lessons of this momentous meeting may be easily drawn. It isclear that there is on all sides anearnest desire to make up for theyears that the locusts have eaten. It is equally clear that it is universally recognised thatthe Mahatma is the fittest person to lead us in our great ~~emprise~~ enterprise. The offer of the dictatorship tothe Mahatma bythe Swarajists is a gesture of no mean significance and gives the lie direct tothe insiniations of sundry persons of the baser sort. It is also clear that if there is a general feeling that the Mahatma's original proposals were too drastic and apt to be unjust in their incidence, there is anequallystrong conviction that some kind of over.hauling is necessary. The necessity for this has been ~~lyally~~ loyally accepted by the Swarajists and we may expect to witness that achieved by cordialco-operation which the Mahatma hoped to bring about by drastic exclusion of the half-hearted. It is also evident that there is a very geneal desire tospeed-up the programme and that thelistlessness of the past has not been due o the lack of faith in it, but rather to the multitude of distracting counsels. These are results over which our opponents have far more reason to be lufabrious than we have and we mayconfidently anticipate under the inspiring leadership of the Mahatma and thecordial co-opratfon-a better thing than the coercion of discipline. of all parties, sucha resurgence of ~~antional~~ a national life as shall carry us irresisitibly to the Haven of the Bromised Land.

JULY 2, 1924

## UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLY AND USE OF FIERARMS.

The report of the Non-official Committee of Enquiry appointed to enquire intothe shootingsometime back of the mill-hands at the Cawnpore Cotton Mills, a summary of which is published ~~every~~elsewhere is a document to which public attention we feel must be drawn. The conclusions of the Committee constitute a challenge to the Government to institute an open official enquiryinto the whole incident. We have not the evidence which the committee had before it nor are we in possession of all the facts necessary to consider the rights and wrongs of the particular allegations. What we are concerned with at present are certain characteristi features of the incident--features, which if we are far-sighted, we should study carefully for our futrue guidance. The circumstances which led to the shooting tragedy are clear. It resulted from a purely economic factor, a dispute about bonus. The mill hands may have deserved the bonus or they may not have. That is a question which we maydecide only with a reference to the whole financila condition of the mills and to the general attitude of the mill hands towards their owrk. One thing may, howeve be stated. It was for the Mills tohave explained to the Mill hands sympathetically whytheir case could not be sustained. Instead of that, the mill manggement's refusal of bounus was communicated in such a wayas tocase discontent among the mill hands and to make them fed that they were deprived of what theywere legitimatelyentitled to. The Non-official

Committee holds that the Police became panicky at the ecitement of themill hands and that in their endeavour to preserve peace they launched a wholly unnecessary baton charge whereupon the hot heads in the crowd began to retaliate with brickbats. The Police became surprised at this reaction to their own initial blunder and ruled, as theywere, by their panicky tmeperament, persuaded themselves or at any rate subsequentlyaffected to persuade themselves that their safety lay in a free use of fire-arms. The non-official enquiry has resulted in the finding that there was no evidence to show that there was reasonable apprehension of any danger to person or property. The crowd was unarmed, and, save for a few brick-bats picked up from the roads--the roads were not under repair and there were no gravel heaps on them-- theyhad no kax other weapon. It was such a crowd that was fired at--a crowd which, according to this report, was hardly dangerous, if indeed it was maliciously mischievous. The firing was a blunder, but it was not an isolated blunder. The District Magistrate was not summoned before firing was resorted to. The warning given to the mill hands was defective. Surely a whisper in a corner is no warning; it is indeed a mockery to issue a warning in a way which does not reach those to whom it was inteneded. Not only that, time was not allowed for those who recieved the warning to profit by that warning. Such are the defects which the Committee allege to have occurred at Cawnpore. Other defects also occur in the use of fire arms. For one thing more force than is necessaryis used. In the Cawnpore case, for example,

more than six volleys were fired, althugh there is no evidence to show that so many volleys of fire were necessary todisperse the mob. It is admitted on theside of the mill authorities themselves that at least the 4th volley produced good efect on the crowd. Why twomore volleys were fired in the circumstance requires an explanation. Nor is that the onl fault in the use of fire-arms. Thehumane practice of aiming low is too aften discarded in this case. In the Cawnpore case it would appear most of theinjuries were inflicted on the upper part of thebody. For these and other reasons, it mustbe held that fire-arms are resorted to in India with an amount of callousness and scandalous disregard of life which must shock reasonable minds in other countries as well as here. In future, we must see toit that this wanton waste of humanlife and energy does not occur. The impartialityof thePolice in disputes between capital and Labour must be scrupulously maintained. Indeed it is the duty of the state to see that these disputes are as much as possible settled in other ways than the wasteful methods of strikes and lock-outs. When unfortunately it so happens that firearms have to be resorted to, they must be used after clear and sufficient warning is given and only to that extent to whichit is absolutely necessary, its use being further so regulated as to entail the least amount of human suffering. These suggestions were made to the Government of India sometime back and a Bill was actually placed in the Council of State by Mr. Sastri and passed by that body. But it was allowed to

lapse, thanks, it is believed, to the orders of Whitehall that such laws will not suit the Orient.

Is it the prevailing theory with the Government that only terrorism and atrocities will avail to maintain law and order in this country? If it is not, it is time they treated the question with more earnestness and less contempt. This contempt for human lives and for public opinion in the country can no longer be tolerated and we shall be surprised indeed if the question is not raised in the next session of the Assembly.

*************

78

1770

JULY 18, 1924.

77

The Indian Colonies Committee have bade farewell to the India Office, but what have they chieved? Nothing, so far as information has been received here. It would appear that the Labours of the Committee have failed to make any useful contribution to the problem of Indians overseas. There can be no other meaning in the statement of Reuter that "there is no information with regard to the answer tobe given to the Committee". The announcement that the matter may be considered by the Cabinet means little. The fact that the Colonies Committee is not to vist East Africa as originally arranged, is, as we have said, tendentions. Does Britain mean that the affairs of East Africa may be ordered without a thought for the interests of its large Indian population? Mr. Thomas justified the exclusion of Indians from the Committee on the ground that its membership was not regulated by local interests. It is on theface of it a mere pretext for it is impossible to say that the members now in the Committee have nothing to do withlocal interests. Many of them have been chosen for their knowledge of local interests. The only conclusion possible is that India is excluded in pursuance of the theory that East Africa is to be a white man's country. And the presence of the Indian Colonies Committee in London does not affect the decision of the Colonial Office. We wonder if Dr. Sapru feels now cured of the false optimism which prompted him to negotiate the Colonies Committee.

*****************

JULY 22, 1924. 78/79 1772

EMIGRATION IN MADRAS

Mr. Paddision's report on the working of the Indian Emigration Act, 1922 and the rules framed thereunder for the year 1923 now before us, is not very helpful to us on the particular questions with which it deals. It is regrettable this should be so in a year which was looked forward to as inaugurating the opertion of the new act. For one thing, as the Commissioner of Labour points out the report is belated; and again, he explained that there was considerable difficulty in getting the figures together. Further, as the Government order recording it has it, we havenot been furnished with the rates of wages and conditions of employment in the provinces and in the Colonies towhich the emigrant proceeded. This must have been helpful in gauging the position of the emigrants and in understanding the causes that induce emigration. We are told that the special feature of the year was the failure of the north east monsoon in the chief recruiting departments, that this resultedin a large increase of emigration in the cold weather which is usually the slackseason. This seems to us an indirect way of admitting that the Indian labourer seeks abroad for a livelihood only as a diversion from seasonal occupation in his homeland, and not because primarily there is so much milk and honey over-flowing across the seas. We note that the total number of labourers, emigrants and non-emigrants sent over to Ceylon was 90, 920, some of whom might have been "counted twice as the journey to and fro is easy", that the number for Malaya States

was 35, 676 passing overother points of interest such as the sanitation and health of the departments, on which we have only meagre information, it is noticed that the Commissioner of Labour has the following pleasant <u>obiter dicta</u> : "For all practical purposes caste ceases across the sea, and these men when theyreturn have an entirely different outlook upon life". In this sense, emigration is undoubtedly doing a great deal for social reform ". Very possibly true, but when we turn to the section relating to returned emigrants, we hardly have any reliable information as to their status, theirabsorption in the home market, their economic position, etc. The Commissioner for Labour states somewhat complacently that there have been few or no cases of irregularitieson the part of therecruiters. This is hard of belief, seeing that most emigrants do not know all the provisions of thenew Act. As regards repatriation the same criticism holds good. Say the Government:- "Under rule 17 of the Indian Emigration Rules every labourer whom a kangani induces to emigrate should be supplied with a vernacular copy of the statement of information approved by the Government of India which contains a clause about repatriation. The Commissioner of Labour is requested to see that this rule is strictly observed and that the terms of employment are carefully explained to thelabourers".

****************

80 1776

AUGUST 2, 1924.

The history of the law of sedition in India notorious for the unscrupulous abuse of the 'Prince of sections' by the bureacracy to repress the legitimate national aspirations of the people. The experience of last four years especially when the Government tortured all sections in its statute-book in combating non-congress and dealing with political offenders, has ~~ppex~~ opened the eyes of all sane citizens to the imperative need for a radical over-hauling of the law of sedition and security sections in this country. Hence it is no wonder tht more thanone leading member of the Legislative Assembly should have devoted his attention to suggesting amendments to the r epressive law. A few days ago we noticed in these columns the proposals of Mr. Patel in this derection. To-day we oublish on another page particulars of two Bills which Mr. A Rangaswamy Iyengar proposes to introduce in the forthcoming meeting of the Assembly. Mr. Iyengar's proposals are more comprehensive than and go far beyond Mr. Patel's in that they seek not only to limit the punishment awarded to political offender but also to re-define the law of sedition, according to notions prevailing in the free countries of the world by confining it to cases when the offender intends to incite the people to violence. In his statement of objects and reasons, Mr. Iyengar shows that this was in fact given out to be the actual scope of thelaw in India when the section was first introduced in thestatute book. The ~~lw was~~ and was abused and took a repressive turn only in its interpretation by the judges. Mr. Iyengar's first Bill only seeks to set

right this judicial abuse besides restricting the punishment to be awarded to politica offenders to what is now imposed in all civilised countries. The second bill is in regard to the much-abused section 144 in the Criminal Procedure Code.

***********

83

82

AUGUST 7, 1924.

1780

THE REFORMS ENQUIRY COMMITTEE.

The Reforms Enquiry Committee has begun its work. That work, as advertised before hand, is to find out the administerative imperfections disclosed in the working of the Government of India Act and make recommendations to remedy those imperfections. The term "administrative imperfections" has been referred to in official documents and in the speeches of official spokesmen both of the Government of India and the India Office for more times than we canreckon off-hand. It is curious, rather, it is significant, howeverthat none are any the wiser for such references. Nobody knows what it exactly means and it is a tribute to the marvellous power of the bureacracy of mystifying the public that it has tothis moment kept the secret to itself. Not eventhe members of the Reforms Committee know what it means. It is a secret securely locked up the onlyperson who maybe expected to possess the keythereto is Sir Alexander Muddiman. The members of the Committee have thus been left to find out for themselves as best they could the connotation of the term by the nature of the questions which the President allows them to put to the witnesses. The folly and theridiculousness of this position are too patent to requre elucidation; but that is the bureacratic way of doing things. This is not however the only circumstance which make of theenquiry partake of the nature of the game of balind-man's -buff. We do not know whether the witnesses have been supplied with all the materials which would enable them to do their work satis-

factorily. Especially the question arises as to whether they have been supplied with the views of Local Governments on the question of reforms. We believe the Local Government's views on the question were collected twice, once about the middle of last year, to which Sir Malcolm Hailey made reference the other dayin the Legislative Assembly and again for first considering the Muddiman Committee's report. It would be interesting to know the terms of the 1923 circular letter of enquiry of the Government of India and those of the later namely, the one forwarding the first Muddiman Committee's report for remarks. It would be something like stabbing the witnesses behing their back if the latter are not allowed an oppurtunity to see what the arguments of the Loal Governments are against their view of the situation. We do not see why, if theenquiry be earne st and based on a sincere desire to assure smooth working, these documents should not be published. By the way, the differences between the earlier reference to the local Governments and the later reference would provide a significant index as to the progress of reaction in the counsels of Simla. The utterly reactionary nature of the first Muddiaman Report has already been referred to by us. It would appear that according to it, not even the transfer of one more subject from the reserved to the transferred list could be recommended by the Committee.

The earlier enquiry would however appear tohave traversed a wider field than the later one. The Reforms Enquiry Committee have, it would appear afreed to the public examination

of such of the witnesses as desire to be examined in public. But a public examin tion of certain witnesses without the public and the witnesses themselves knowing all th facts of the case are called upon to give evidence canonly be of doubtful utility. Why should the Government of India seek to do things in the dark or the local Governments fight shy of the publication of their views? Is it the case that what the Government seek to do is to secure suggestions as to the provision of such additional rules or such modification of the existing ones as was illustrated by the promulgation of thenew rules as additions to the Indian Legislative Rules in March last dealing with dilatory and other motions and later of rules relating to additional grants last month? If their case is strong, the publication of their views can only help them. The non-publication of the documents can only mean that their case is weak. Will the non-official members of the Committee unanimously press for their ~~fx~~ publication?

86

85 1786

AUGUST 15, 1924

EUROPEANS AND THE REFORMS

Whatever the attitude of the European in India towards the Reforms question that of their association is hardly edifying. A summary of the evidence of the Association submitted to the Muddiman Committee is published everywhere from which it will be found how hostile is Assocaition to any advance onthe Government of India Act of 1919 ,. Indeed the Association's suggestions in regard to the modification in the Act and Rules show that it would fain go back on even the Montford Act. It is satisfied that the reforms have failed that the legislatures are not representative and that considered as a step towards representative responsible Government, dyarchy has ignominiously failed. The Association makes much of the fact that the legislatures do not fully or accurately represent the country and that under the presentsystem of representation, power, whatever there is of it, has passed into the hands of a vociferous clique. One should have thought that if the difficulty was due to the unrepresentative character of the legislatures the Association would have made recommendations which would rectify the defect. What it does, however, is to propose indirect representation and question its own seriousness in the matter by expressingits conviction that no system of election, but only nominations, could secure accurate representation. More suggestive of the Association's real purpose in making its representation to the Committee is its demand that the legislature should be prohibited from even discussingthe reserved subjects except with the

permission of the bureacracy, i-e. for the prurpose fof kelping it. The "reserved" subjects should not even be talked about--so sacred are they in theeyes of this body claiming to work for the welfare of India as well as of the European community! If any more evidence were necessary regarding the essentially selfish outlook of this body, it is provided in a significant passage in its curent QUARTERLY REVIEW. "To any man with an ounce of commonsense" , we are told, " it must obvious that there are two things which every European in India should do. One is to join the Auxiliary Force, sot that he has a definite place in some organisation should the worst happen and the other is to support his own political organisation." The persistent use of political power to secure their own selfish interests and the conscription of the whole community into a fully equipped military phalanx in war formation at India's expense to make, as the Association's Review suggests, that political pressure effective are not, we hope, the be-all and end-all of the typical European in India. The European Association one suspects, plays more to thetune of the die-hards in England then to the European resident in this country although unfortunately, the European Press h ere is becoming more andmore inclined to accept the "Home" gospel made in the Sydenham- O'Dwyer factory. Thus the Statesman sees Earl Winterton turn an apost te to the Montford doctrine a nd straight way comments approvingly of his act. ....... The question is: Sho ld it ever continue to be so? Cannot the European in India find solace in the nobler purpose andhigher idels which India wants him to pursue than in thetransient pleasure which alone power assures?

88

1790

AUGUST 18, 1924. 67

Mr. Zimand the American Press Correspondent, who visitied this country early this year has given his impressions of the political situation here in an interesting article in the "NEW YORK TIMES" which is extracted on another page. Thanks to the activities of adventurous professors or paid progpagandists in the service of the British Government, there is perhaps no countryin the world which is nore misinformed about India than America. The geneality of Americans possess purely false and sometimes even fantastic notions abut our people, their uncivilised nature, prosperity under British rule and contentment with their political status and alien rule. To those the following passage with which the article opens would have come as a veritable eye-opener revealing to them the real state of affairs in this countryand the dark depth of political discontent among the people. Writes Mr. Zimand: "It is impossible for a person to be longer than 24hours in India without realising that the one sixth of the human race inhabiting the Indian peninsula are living under stormy skies. After traversing the Penisnsula from Bombay to the Bay of Bengal, and from the Himalays to the south, I am convinced that there is a feeling of profound and univesal distrust in the country. One hears nothing but expressions of bitterness and animosity against the Government". In the remaining portion of the article the writer has shown with a remarkable array of evidence how widespread and genunine is the desire for Swaraj among all sections of the people.

AUGUST 21, 1924.

REFORMS ENQUIRY AND THE CRY OF "HALL"

With almost one vőice the Anglo-Indian Press ha , as it were, set up an agitation calling upon the Government, in the interests of economy--how hypocritical this plea Enquiry Committee. Although the enquiry is dubbbed " a farce" the anxiety to put an end to it shows an amount of apprehension behind it too clearly perceptible to be hidden The die-hards could not see ex-Minister after ex-Minister exposing the iniquities of the bureacracy and the autocracy of the Governor and proclaiming to the world at large what an insulting farce of a n- incipient responsible government dyarchy was. Theyhad helplessly to look on this exposure ofr, no amount of cross-examination on the part of their representatives on th Committee could break the anti-dyarchy witnesses. Theywold almost appear tobe reconciled to the inevitable conclusion that dyarchy has failed and miserably failed; for,the trend of their cross-examination shows that theyare now more concerned with demonstrating that further constitutionaladvance is impossible than with defending dyarchy. And here too, unfortunately for them, mattes are not developing as theywould wish them to develop Theybuilt much on the Non-Brahmin witness, Mr. Surve of Bombay, for his memorandum was such as to console them. This witness professed that but for the firm and continued rule of the British bureacracy the depressed and backward classes woul be kept under andfround down by the higher classes. He was exploited to the full by the President and his bureacratic colleague, Sir HenryMoncrieff Smith. The witness faithfully followed the lead of these die-hards

90

1799

SEPTEMBER 1, 1924.

89.

To those who would yet see in the Swarajists' programme a policy of mere negation and nothing else, the interview with Mr. Das which appears in our telegraphic columns to-day, is calculated to be of some help. In that task, Mr. Das makes it clear that the task of the Bengal Swarajists is far from complete. The bringing about of adead-lock is only a preliminary; and fromone point of view even that preliminiary cannot be said to be complete unless something else also is accomplished. The key to their success lies with the electorate; and if the electorate is neglected the bureacracy may be trusted to take advantege of such neglect. Dissolution of the Council may be ordered at any moment and the Swarajists should be prepared for the eventauality which means that they should cultivate the constituencies and be in the most intimate touch with them possible. Incidentally, the masses may also be educated. Mr. Das, it is significant, does not contemplate the offering of mass civil disobedience. He thinks it unnecessary. Not less significant is Mr. Das's attitude regarding futher reform. He is not, he said, inimical to Britain and is not unwilling to arrive at a settlement by negotations. His preliminary demands must appear surprisingly modest even tohis British critics for he pleads only for "some control in the Legislative Assembly". Mr. Das proclaimed himself a constitutionalist and firmly disowned the partyof violence, a circumstance whichought to soothe the troubled feelings of die-hards like Lord Curzon. Mr. Das however added that if public opinion were flouted the party of violencemay grow in strength

91

90

1796

a propositionwwhich is an unpleasant as truth often is. Mr. Das's statement, we dare say, doesmt not complete the whole essence of the Swarajists' programme, for then the Swarajists will be dubbed a party of talkers pure and simple. Their programme must be read with the Congress programme wherein contains its complement. The work of national reconstruction on self-relieantlins is a crying need of the hour and no political party in the country can afford to ignore it and yet retain for it the support or even the sympathy of the public.

*************

91

92

1798

SEPTEMBER 1, 1924.

The Legislative Assembly will soon be asked to give its approval to the Government's proposals on the Lee Report. Whatever these proposals are, we have had enough of hints toshow that they will not be popular. Lord Oliver made no secret of the fact th the forthcoming consultation of the Assembly on the subject is almost a superflouous farce which the Government are going to stage because they will not in any way be the losers thereby. The Government have resolved on a certain course and theywill stick to it. If the Assembly approved of it, well and good. If not, they will go their own way in spite of the Assembly just as they went about their own way in appointing the Commission on the face of the Assembly's emphatic opposition. Such is the officials position. They seek no compromise and no offer thereof will be accepted. The duty of the representatives of the people in this connection is clear. They too seek no compromise and any offer of it must be summarily rejected. The Lee proposals constitute a violence of every right of ours andmust be dismissed with the contempt they deserve. We dare say the Assembly is keenly alive to its reputation as well as to its rights.

*************

93

SEPTEMBER 4, 1924. 92 1800

TOWARDS UNITED ACTION

It is significant that two such widely differing individuals as Dr. Besant and Mahatma Gandhi should at the same time insist on a single course as being the need of the hour--the need for national unity. Mahatma Gandhi referred to it in his speech at the Excelsior Theatre in Bombaythe other day. "I have resolved ", said he, in the course of that speech, "that there should be no opposition from me either at the Belgaum Congress or before that so as to divide the country. - - - - - Without anger or hatred, we must make a Herculean effort to get out of that condition, and the country could work, not for her own good only, but also for the good of th humanity". These words should not be interpreted as meaning in any way that what the great leader is anxious about is to get himself extricated from politics so that he might spend his days in a quiet retreat. The significance of the "surrender " that he speaks of is quite different from that. It is explained in the Young India article which aspecial message to own columns brings to us to-day. It bespeaks a determination to carry the nation with him; for, he seeks the salvation not of himself only, but of the country and indeed of humanity in general. He is therefore concerned at present in finding out the geatest common factor among all the parties in the country, withdevsing a programme which will appeal to all alike and inthe execution of which lies the seed of aself-reliant nation. Mahatma Gandhi's programme will not be purely a negative one. He will not be content with ceasing to offer an oppositon. He will

conduct an intensive campaign to carryout the constructive programme. There are many who honestly differ from him and hold th t simply to stick tothe Charka is to hope to achieve the impossible. Mr. Gandhi would not denythem the right to their opinions. Enough for him if, in their own peaceful programmes, his humble weapon also found a place. Herein lies the difference between Mahatma Gandhi and some of his disciples. Differences there are among the p rties and fresh ones may arise in thefuture but the outstandingfact in the situation remains that these different methods of activities are directed towards a common object and that therefore it mustat any time be possible to arrive at a common programme. Its cope may be limited, but this limitation may be made up for by the universal acceptence which would be its chracteristic feature. The possibility of such a programme cannot be denied and the fact is of happy augury that Dr. Besant fully recognises it as will be evident from the interview which Dr. Besant accorded to our representative yesterday. For, too often it has been the case with us th t pesonalities counted more than principles. Thus, in many quarters, the Charka has been condemned, not because of any intrinsic defect in its use, but because of its political association. If all parties in the countrycould but rise above petty prejudices like these, thenwe do not think that there will be inseperable difficulties in common action. The Nationalists, of course could not afford to give up their principles or detract from demands which they feel are the minimum th t could be accepted consistent with their ideas of the best interests of the nation. But we fail to see why, on this score, they need stay away from concerted action calculated to secure for them an advance towards their goal. We have in Britain a solid wal of opposition presented to us. May we not the easier break it through united action?

94 1804

SEPTEMBER, 8th, 1924.

CONGRESS AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

The signal victory of three out of the four Congress candidates who contested the city municipal elections the day before yesterday and the uncontested return of an old councillor who joined the Congress municipal party prior to his nomination, clearly shows once more that Madras rate-payers have caught the new spirit of civic reform and freedom which the Congress is trying to infuse into our local bodies. The voters have discharged their duty splendidly and it is now for the new members who have been returned with such overwhelming support to justify the confidence reposed in them by their unflinching courage disciplined action and loyalty to the popular cause. The speeches and actions of the Congress members, who are now seven in all, will naturally be keenly watched and scrutinised by the rate-payers with an even greater attention and rigour than would be exercised in the case of the other members and we hope they will fulfil the expectations they have raised in the public mind by ever remaining true to the ideals of the Congress and placing the City's welfare and improvement over every other consideration. In the simple but very necessary programme th Gandhiji sketched out in his reply to the Municipal address at Ahmedabad they have clearly marked out lines of civic work and reform which are in need of urgent attention in almost every city in this country, including our own.

-----------

96

1806

95

SEPTEMBER 15, 1924.

The repeated and unexpected outbreaks of Hindu-Muslim violence and disorder show how serious the communal problem is daily growing, debying solution. After Delhi and Nagpur it was Gulbarga. Last week it was Kohat, this week it is Lucknow. The malady instead of subsiding seems to be spreading. Whichever party is to blame in each of the above places, sensible and patriotic persons of both communities should refuse to take either sides. They should view the whole question dispassionately from the standpoint not of any particular community but of the nation. When a Hindu or Mohamedan is killed or injured in such riots it should be remembered it is the national cause that suffers most, not the communal or religous. Probably in most cases the points at dispute will have nothing to do with the real interests of the communities quarrelling. It is the work of ignorant fanatics and on either side who create a panic and draw a large number of the unthinking masses into the quarrel. The remedy lies only in the hands of the better and more sensible section of both the communities who should make it and systematic efforts to carry the message of true nationalism to the masses and expose the evils of false communalism. It is futle to speak here of the Government's responsibilities. Unity is the supreme need of the hour.

----------

SEPTEMBER 16, 1924.

The debate on the Lee Report in the Council of State is not yet over, but the fruits of the first days discussion, a report of which appears elsewhere, constitute a true speciamen of what we might expect of that body. Finding that direct opposition to the Report will not succeed, Sir Devaprasad Sarbadhikari proposed a moion suggesting postponement of the consideration of the Report. Sir Mohamed Shafi, the Law Member, deprecated the move in words surpassing Sir B. N. Sarma's in the Assembly. The Law Member held that the Lee Report indeed gave us practically all that we wanted --Indianisation, provincialisation and what not -- and suggested th t it was virtually, and ungrateful of us to seek to jettison it. The august Assembly , whether moved or unmoved by this speech and others of the same variety, threw out Dr. Sarbadhikari's amendment, as also another, a substantive one by Mr. Karnadikar. In due course it may be expected similarly to dispose of other popular amendments as well. Truly the council of state is the very haven of the bureacracy untroubled by the popular waves outside and it has in every way more than fulfilled the far-seeing intentions of its ingenious authors.

---

SEPTEMBER 18, 1924

97

1810

Mahatma Gandhi's resolve in the presentcondition of his health to undertake a fast for 21 days will be received with deep-felt anxiety and pain through out the country. The resolve is born out of unbearable distress at the recent Hindu-Muslim disturbances. The anguish of his heart is well brought out in his message, appearing everywhere, wherein he communicates his resolve to the country. It is intended by the great soul to serve as a penance for his own and the peoples' failure to accomplish communal unity as well as a silent prayer to the two communities concerned not to commit suicide by such mutual quarrels. If every leader in the country had displayed as much zeal in th cause of communal unity as Mahatmaji, the problem though not solved by this time, would at least have been kept well within control, and not certainly allowed to assume such dangerous proportions at it has developed at the present day.

The disturbances are in the forceful words of the Mahatma " a disgrace to religion and humanity", and the disgrace belongs as much to the warring sections as to those who remain passive witnesses to the outbreaks without exerting their utmost to bring about peace. Mahatmaji's grim resolve will it is to be hoped, stir the nation from out of its torpor and awaken the people of all communities to a sense of their true responsibilities to the Nation, Humanity and God.

-:-:-:-:-:-:-:-:-:-:-

99

98

1812

SEPTMEBER 20, 1924.

# PARTY POLITICS AND NATIONAL ACTION.

By far the most important factor on which the future of India depends is the internal situation in the country. The other principal factors such as the attitude of the bureacracy and of British public opinion have their own influence, but they are of secodary importance and are by no means the governing factors. The all_domination factor is the internal situation in the country. What thenare the characteristic features of this situation? How are we to control it? That is the question we should now address ourselves to. Here, unfortunately, things are by no means satisfactory. What we witness here is a confusion of the multitude of voices, programmes and parties. Of parties in the country we have so many that we could not reckon them off-hand. We have Gandhities, Swarajists, Liberals and that intangible conglameration of politicains to whom the term of reactionaries may not unjustly be applied. Among these politicains themselves there are varying shades of differences so that it is not unusual to talk of Left and Right Wings in one and the same party. Thus one hears of the Left Wing of the Liberal Party as represented by the Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri and of the Right Wing thereof under the lead of Sir Siva-swami Iyer and Sir C. H. Setalwad. Fissiparous forces are at work in other ways as well, for we have also to reckon these caste and communal schisms whic operate vertically with more or less intensity in the provinces.

It may perhaps be useful to enter int these factors in some greater detail soas to perceive the more clearly the weaknesses of the parties and their programmes. To take the Gandhi ites first. Their programme has now been reduced to a purely social and economic one and is only remotely and indirectly political. They are at work at the foundations of national character and national life, which, having been taken care of, they feel they have no need to take care of the rest. An admirable programme for the pious, patient, plodding citizen, but one which to yield results will take too long a time to mae it acceptable to the public at large. By itself the Gandhiite programme has proved caviare to the general. Then come the Swarajists. Their programme is bold and spectacular, but is essentially weak not only because it is sectional, but also because, as events have proved, it will have to adjust itself to an elector te which on all accounts is too narrow to be accepted as the spokesman of the nation's will. If the Gandhiite programme is defective in that it is too substantial, the Swarajist one is defective in that it is too spicy The goal in the Liberal programme is a little less radical but is much the same as that of the other parties. It is cautious, but caution is not necessarily bad in itself. The real defect in the Liberal programme lies in its premieses and in th general out-look of its leading exponents. In any case it is an admitted fact that as a reactionaries. The programme of these politicians being negative, they necessarily profit by the set backs to any or all of the parties.

The difficulties given rise to by the party devisions described avove have been accentuated by unfortunate communal schisms. The root causes of these differences are now well known and are being steadily removed. These existed in 1921 when these was no communal disharmony. The immediate cause for the malady must therefore be sought everywhere. One of the potent causes for the schism, it appears to us, is the destruction of the early fiath in the common programme, which proved so powerful a cement between the two communities. In the years 1920, 1921 and 1922, Non-co-operation provided an excellent bond between the communities because it gave promise of action. Its receding from the political arena into something akin to an ascetic exclusionism left the house swept and garnished for the devils of communalism to occupy. The closer examination of religion --not dogma but the spiritual element--led to a revival of the religious spirit. When politics is talked of in terms of religion, it is not long before religon becomes politics. In India where fanaticsm is easily aroused, the result must tend to be a proselytising campaign on every side and inevitable conflicts. Reaction, mutual suspicion, the u-ndoing of the communal unity of erarly days--these it is that have thrived in consequence. The remedy is not far to seek. It must be found in unityin politics, in the growth of tolerance in religion andingeneral in therapied diffusion of enlightened ideas all round. What is require is the binding force of a common programme with generous mutual agreements. The unifying force of the Bardoli programme is of real value

here, but its action must be slow. Whatever that be there is no escaping the fact that self-government will be a dream if real unity among parties and communites is not achieved in the near future. That is the lesson which the experince of the last two years teaches us. It will be deplorable if we fail to learn and profit by it.

-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-

SEPTEMBER 29, 1924 102 1820

## THE UNITY CONFERENCE

The unity Conference which opend at Delhi on Friday is a memorable event. It is noteworthy alike for its representative character, the friendly atmosphere that pervaded it and the spirit in which it has set itself to work. In it were represented noy only the leaders of the various communities in India but also the acknowledged representatives of the great religions. The latter measure was a wise step for in most cases the friction among the communities which later developed into ~~rits~~ riots had at its bottom a religious basis. The fact that the cause was more often imagined to be religious than its really being sodid not affect the hostilities for the better. Ostensibly most of the conflicts began with a religous excuse. How wrongly a religious coating was given to them is evident from the fact that the heads of all important communities agreed that none of the conflicts could be justified on a religious basis. The representatives of the three great relgions in the country--Dr. West Cott, Moulvi Kifayatullah, Pandit Malaviya-- all alike laid emphasis on the brotherhood of man andon the essential mistake of those who acted as though in thoughtless ~~Bolldshed~~ Bloodshed lay their salvation. The representaties of the various communities equally recognised the need for unityand brotherliness. Some of the speeches at th conference seem to be have been of a very high order and of an elevating kind. The speech of the representative of the European community, Mr. Arthur Moore of the STATESMAN, appears to have attracted particular attention.

104



1822

103

The whole scene must have beenimposing and the atmosphere gkixnfixxxnfxdnxhxndx friendly, and such as realised that the best interests of the country demanded that inter-communal relations, where they take the form of rivalry or friction must be determined, not by resort to whatever weapon comes in handy tobreak men's heads, but by resort to arbitration and if need be even to law courts. The resolution drafted by the Subjects Committee for adoption by the Conference gives expression to this feeling. One of the propostions of the resolution affirms that the Conference that the Conference regards "the loss of life, the burning and the plunder of property and the desecration of temples" as "bashvarous and contrary to religion". Another expresses the opinion of the Conference that " it is unlawful and irreligious for any person to take the law into his own hands by way of retaliation or punishment". A third says that " all differences, no matter of what nature, should be referred to an arbitrarator or, if that be impossible, even to a court of law". There can be no statement less unambiguous than these and it is to be hoped that the wisdom of these reasolutions will presently percolate to every strata of society in India. The propositions enunciated here are nothing more nor antyhing less than an assertion that we in India shall tolerate nothing but the rule of ordered law and public opinion. The resolution further constitutes a declaration that there can be no religious sanction behind the use of coercion without the sanction of an impartial judicial verdict to support it. The nation is sick of the atrocities committed in the name of

religion. Enlightened opinion is nw seriously engaged in seeing how satisfaction could be brought to all parties in cases of conflict of claims. As it is, it not seldom happens that the question whether a particular party is right or wrong in having taken a particular course is decided by the different communities in favour of their own communities. That is to say, the tendency is unmistakable to arrogate righeousness to one's own side as far as possible and that side is almost always the side of one's co-religionists. This ought not in the future to be; and it can be avoided only if each one of us attempts to develop a judicial conscience as well as a communal one. The Leaders' Conference Delhi would have achieved its purpose, if it succeeds in awakening or, if necessary, in installing this conscience if not in the place of, at least by the ~~six~~ side of the communal conscience in the minds of the people.

------------

166

1826

OCTOBER 3, 1924. 105.

There is apparently no end to attempts at propping up or reviving dyarchy in Bengal, according, i.e. as one holds that dyarchy is dead or alive. Lord Lytton's latest communique is a fresh endeavour to resuscitate that thrice discredited form of government. Though it takes the shape of a reply to the Indian Association, the communique is really a feeler thrown out to the "Moderate elements" in the Council to rally themselves together in such strength as would be able to out-vote the Swarajist-cum-Independent majority. It is significant that what Lord Lytton demands as the price for re-submitting the vote to the Council is a gurantee from majority of the Councillors that they would support the Ministers if and when appointed by him. The Councillors ought to consider deeply if this is an offer which they could accept in justice to their sense of their self respect. We shall not here enter into the controversy as to whether the isue in the Bengal struggle was the fate of the dyarchy or the Huq-Ghrznavi Ministry. Granting that the issue was not the former and was the latter, even then the councillors have a heavy responsibility in the matter. The issue, so far as they are concerened, is the right of nomination of the Ministry. Although under the Act their right is only negative, it must be affirmative if they are to secure even the little power which they expect out of accepting dyarchy. But here Lord Lytton does not help them. He asks them to gurarantee unconditional support for the Ministry as a condition previous to appointing the Ministers. How can the Council pledge support before knowing who the Ministers are and what their policy is? Despite Mr. Mullick's jibes, we hope the Councillors will think deeply of their constitutional responsibilities before they agree to the Lytton suggestion.

Mr. Mullick remarked that the reason why the Ministers were defeated was that these were not enough of them. Two or three Ministers in Bengal, he said, were sure to be the targets of the criticism and the hostility of those others "Who were called, but not chosen", "The only remedy", he declared, "is to make everybody a Minister. You will then have 129 persons to work the Reforms in Bengal.". The Councillors we hope will not be intimidated by this charge of entertaining unworthy selfish ambition into signing away their rights into the hands of Lord Lytton and his admiring followers.

--------------

108

1830

October 8, 1924.

107

It is one of the tragic ironies of imperialism that even ordianrily well-intentioned and liberal-minded thinkers in the ruling nation become blind to the truth of certain fund-amental political axioms, lose their faith in freedom and get prejudiced against the just claims of the people striving to liberte themselves from the shackles of the dominant power. The failure of Lord Morley, the great Liberal statesman and philosopher as Secretary of State for India, was due to this inherent defect of the systems and the actions and the utterances of other British satesman in regard to Indian affairs, not excluding some of the Labour leaders, have also betrayed this political perversion. A special cable received from London gives a summary of a characteristic speech made by Mr. H.A.L. Fisher, at a luncheon of the Canadian Club. The arguments he has advanced therein against the extension of self-Goverement to India are the typical stock-in-trade of the perverted political creed of good people spolt by a bad system. He feels that it will be unwise to grant us more freedom until we show to the British that we are willing and able to do to our country some good in the field of Education, public hygene, religion and coomerce. This betrays a colossal ignorance of Indian History and achievements in the past on the part of the ex-cabinet Miister as well as his utter indifference to some of the constructive movements now in progress in this country to better the moral and material welfare of the masses. Mr. Fisher is putting the cart before the horse in asking to show evidence of our capacity to improve the conditions in the country without allowing us the necessary freedom and facilities to carry out our schemes. He notes with some anxiety that a class of inte-

llectual and professional men of which Mr. Gandhi is a type are gaining formidable influence over the people is in every way superior to and more ennobling than that exercised by professional politicians and bullying demagogues in England and other European countries which are acclaimed to be fit for freedom and democracy.

-------------

1834

OCTOBER 10, 1924.

109.

## THE CHOICE

Without any desire to belittle the importance of the coming session of the non-Brahmin confederation it may be permissible to point out that there are still left members of the communities of which it claims to be the mouth-piece who do not regard the Indian National Congress with the eye of suspicion and aversion. It would not help us however to set down to mere factitiousness the attitude taken up by what for a more comprehensive term we have to describe the "Justice" Party and affect to despise it. Wrong-headed in many of its actions as we believe it to have been it yet represents forces which it would be foolish to ignore and unpatriotic to exasperate. That party has in the main seen eye to eye with advanced opinion in national questions and the recent movement for unity, both communal and political, has not left it unaffected. Certain prominent leades of the party have indicated a distinct appreciation of the value of team-work and the danger of centrifugal tendencies in the midst of a national struggle. It is to say the least unfortunate that a schism should have been created in the party over this question. Our readers will have been enlightened on the matter sufficiently by the letters we have been publishing on the elusive Presidentship of the Confederation to have formed their own impressions. The choice of course is not ordinarily a matter for their or our concern. But Sir K. V. Reddy indicates in his letter published elsewhere, there is more behind the controversy than the mean jealousies that loom so large to excited minds. A definite question of policy is involved and from the broader interests both of the party

and the country it is regrettable that narrow sectarianism triumphed. The party which dominates the confederation has its own importance in the scheme of things. It is perhaps an importance which is easily capable of over-estimation. National work will not stop for want of its co-operation though with it, it will conceivable be facilitated. If the reactionaries succeed in persudading the confederation that its best interests lie in the direction of sectional captiousness and they will only be standing in its light. But let us emphasise there is no question of asking the non-Brhamin fly to walk into the congress parlour. So long as the spirit of communal suspiciousness and bitterness is not exercised so long will remain problematical the value of the party's co-operation. If it chooses to trace its lonely furrow in the lonely in the arid sands of communal jealousy and internal bickering, it will remain an object of interest and slightly xxx scandalised curiosity but hardly one of respect or sympathy. It is for the party to choose how long will it continue to permit the strangle hold which reactionaryism like an Old Man of the sea has acquired around its neck. The preliminary skirmishes over the choice of the President do not give much hope in this direction- but let us hope for the best.

------------

OCTOBER 18, 1924:- 111 1838

THE REFORMS ENQUIRY

Whatever be the ultimate result of the labours of the Reforms Committee, the one incontestable fact that has been established before it is that dyarchy has failed, utterly failed. Minister after Minister has come up with the dolorous tale of enthusiasm giving place to disillusionment by the inherent unworkability of the system and the latest to unburden his soul before the Committee is Sir Provash Chandar Mitter, an ex-Minister of Bengal followed by Sir Purushothamdas Thakurdas, a commercial magnate of Bombay. Th evidence of Sir P.C. Mitter is in a sense, of unique signifcance, for he was not merely an enthussiast of dyarchy but even a part author of it. He was one of those, who, as he admitted before the Committee helped Sir Lionel Curtis in hatching this wonderful scheme of divided government. That a man who had essayed to work the scheme with such a strong bias in its favour should now come forward and proclaim that it is all a mistake is testimony of no mean value. Sir P.C. Mitter said that "dyarchy failed because while Ministers always looked to their majority in the Council, the Members of the Government in the reserved half looked to the Government of India and the Secretary of State. Naturally there was a divided house and the position was insatisfactory and unworkable. One wonders that the weakness of dyarchy so convincingly enunciated now by this Moderate Leader escaped his view when he embraced it with delight. But to his credit it must be said that now that he has realised the mistake he does not mince words and makes his condemnation sufficiently strong. The remedy he suggests is the estab-

lishment of unitary, responsible government with ~~axlarge~~ complete provincial autonomy, togehter with a large mesure of responsibility in the central government.

The evidence of Sir P. C. Mitter is interesting in other respects as well. During the course of his cross examination by members of the Committee he had a number of interesting things to say about various aspects of the political situation. Thus he made an illuminating comment on the anarchist movement in Bengal. He was categorically of opinion that anarchism would die the moment India gets Swaraj. "The grant of responsible government would deprive the anarchists of public sympathy on which they were banking a good deal at present and would choke the field for recruitment". Coming from a member of the Rowlatt Committee this opinion must have its own weight, provided i.e. the Government are in a mood to uproot anarchism by finding out the suitable remedy. Another point in the evidence to which we should like to draw attention is a strange suggestion regarding the oath of allegiance in the Council. Sir P. C. Mitter has profusely complimented the swarajists for their organisation, for the patriotism, for their having exploded the mockery of reforms, but apparently continues to regard them with aversion. He therefore advances the movel idea that with a view to keeping out the obstructionists the members' oath should contain a pledge to work the construction. Even Sir Alexander Muddiman seems to have been surprised at the suggestion, but Sir Provash Chander himself appears to doubt the efficacy of his recipe since he fears that "the Swarajists

could be conciliated, but another and more extreme party might spring up". He might as well have suggested an oath to ensure that Mitterities alone would be allowed to sit in Council.

The evidence of Sir Purushotamdas Thakurdas follows the line of other Moderate leaders in demanding the abolition of dyarchy and the intorduction of provincial autonomy, but is noteworthy in one respect. In his advocacy of changes in the central Government Sir Purushotamdas goes one step further. He is not satisfied with some measure of responsibility in the Central Government. The Liberal Federation asked for responsibility only in departments other than the army, foreign and political. Sir Purushotamdas wants responsibility all through except for limited reservation in foreign and political the army being placed under a Minister with the Commander-in-Chief as an advisor. But the committee has given an inkling of how it is likely to view this demand. Sir Aledander Muddiman asked the witness whether in view of the undesirability of continuing dyarchy it was not better to go back to the pre-reform days of autocracy. Now the only way out of the present impasse is either to go forward or to draw back and it is significant that the official mind contemplates going back as the easier process. It would not be a surprise if instead of recommending an advance the Committee proposes the scrapping of the reforms and a march back. Indeed the impression is growing, says our Simla correspondent that the labours of the committee might end in some such way and all the expectations mursed in certain quarters might end in thorough disappointment.

- - - - - - -

OCTOBER 21, 1924. -

When Sir John Maynard criticised Dyarchy as being full of anomalies but wound up by saying that he was not thereby opposed to it, he only exhibited that slovenly English mentality which used to excite such holeywrath in Arnold. Passing over it, the critical readers will notice that the Finance Member of the Punjab Government has in his evidence furnished the best testimony yet available to the need for further constitutional advance. True he guarded himself by saying that he had no suggestions ready and that he was appearing on behalf of his Government with the intention purely of removing misapprehensions arising from Lala Harkishen Lal's statement. Granted: but let us see what an analysis of his evidence yeids. The first thing that strikes us is his grudging admission that the Government of India was prone to intolervene somewhat excessively in provincial affairs. He also agreed that these was no conceivable half-wayhouse on the road to complete autonomy. He was aware of the imperfections of Dyarchy and though he tried to Whittle the same away, his statement that Ministers and Members were eager for upholding Law and Order must tend to quiet the bogey of many nervous souls. On a par is his statement that the Punjab is a most peace-loving province; and his retort to Sir Alexander Muddiaman is crushing as an extinguisher. His somewhat naive confession that though an excellent Minister Lala Harikishenlal found the impossibility of much creditable achievement is an approvpriate pendant to his criticism of Dyarchy.
And, again, speaking on that vexed theme, so dear to mean Sir Mohamed Shafi he bodly expressed his view that the Lucknow

Pact was satisfactory to the majority of practical minded Moslems in the Punjab and that recent dissatisfaction against the Pact was a happy gamble on the Refomrs Committee itself and he added a good word when he said that Communal feelings had been exaggerated by the Reforms and that they were called into play only where the loaves and fishes of office were concerned. Though he gave the common and good form of official reactionaryism in reagard to transfer of subjects he was still willing to advance as in the matter of irrigation. Obviously the witness is personally willing to go a great way forward. In the case of a witness who has been so far outspoken, we have no wish to be censorious and do not propose to examine the routine officials view which he has here and there expressed. In its ensemble the evidence is remarkable as strenthening the case for further advance.

- - - - - - -

117 1848

OCTOBER 22, 1924.

Sir Chimanlal Setalvad's evidence before the Reforms Enquiry Committee throws a flood of light on the tyrannical and irresponsible way in which the Governor may act under dyarchy. He showed how from the start the Governor of Bombay had set his face against his reforms and how it was absolutely impossible to rehabilitate dyarchy any more in the Provinces. He was able to reinforce his contentions from side-lights furnished by his knowledge of the inner working of Sir George Lloyd's Government. And he foiled the attempt of the Home Member to trip him up on the ground that there was then no dyarchy in Bombay and that therefore Bombay's experience was of no avail in the matter under enquiry. Nothing can better expose the anomalous position in which the Ministers are placed than the Governor's powers under dyarchy and Sir George Lloyd's use of those powers. Sir Chimanlal showed how Sir George Lloyd treated his Ministers more or less as unwlecome advisers imposed on him only to be consulted when necessary and ignored with contempt whereever possible. He did not call them into consultation as recommended by the Joint Committee, nor did he even let one Minister know what the other was doing. Instead of paving the way for complete Responsible Government and making the Ministers realise that the responsibility for their acts vested on themselves, he did not make them act at all. The Ministers were thus reduced to salaried ciphers who were forced to let go under their name Government orders in the framing of which they had little or no effective part. Let the Law Officers backed up the reactionary Governor. What a mocking mirage of Responsible Government dyarchy has proved to be! Sir Chimanlal's evidence, it will be noticed, does little credit

117

118

1850



to the Ministers. Were not they mere place-hunters, it was their duty to have refused to work in such disgusting circumstances. Our men like Mr. Paranjpye who share with Sir Chimanlal himself and others the responsibility for guiding Liberal thought allowed themselves to be treated by Sir George Lloyd like dumb, driven cattle. Sir Chmanlal drew the correct inference from his defeat at the polls which, he rightly held, pointed to the fact that no safeguard was possible against obstruction unless there was a further bold advance. Safegurads enough Sir Chimanlal has advocated as the reader will see from the evidence, but on the question of advance he was very clear and emphatic. He was for immediate provincial autonomy in the major provinces and for an element of dyarchy in the Central Government. And he went ahead of most of the witnesses when he demanded that substantial steps should be taken to Indianise the Army, as an earnest of Government's good faith.

-----------

118 119 1852

OCTOBER 24, 1924

A BUREAUCRTIC ALTERNATIVE TO DYARCHY

*　　*　　*　　*　　*

----------- - - An eyewash of constitutional concessions is bound to fail as miserably as the brute remedy of repression. The Lt- Governors' scheme may associate Indians in every branch of administration, but it is yet seriously defective from more than one point of view. In the first place it does not do away with the radical defect in the Indian constitution to remove which it was that the Montford enquiry was undertaken. The incompatibility of a representative body having an elected majority with an irremovable executive over which it has no control is a serious defect which the Lt-Governors' scheme suffers from. In the 2nd place there is no element of responsibility in that scheme which the Montford Report postulated as essential and which the Government of India Act defined as its objective. " That some responsibility must be given at once if our scheme is to have any value" was one of the "posutulates" with which the authors of the Montford Report started; responsibility they defined "as consisting mainly in amenability to constituents and in the second place in amenability to an Assembly". The Lt.- Governor's scheme does not satisfy this "governing condition" formulated by the Montford Report and subsequently accepted by Parliament. To accept it now would in fact be tantamount to going back to pre-Montford Reform days. If any further criticisms be necessary of this scheme, one has only to turn to paragraphs 20 to 25 of the Government of India's despatch dated March 25, 1919.

"Our judgment on the majority minute may", they wrote, " be summed up by saying that we regard it in the first place as failing to lay any measure of definable responsibility for any act of Government upon the representatives of the electorate, we therefore hold that it does not comply with the policy upon which the Home Government have decided. In the second place, it fails to fulfil what its authors themselves present as the paramount requirement of a n undivided Government, a unity which can to our tinking be secured only by a common allegiance and a common policy. In the theird place it affords no prospect of successful working without giving rise to such conflict and bitterness of feeling as may produce a dead-lock, and in the fourth place the scheme cannot progress in any direction except by one leap into full Responsible Government". Does any one, official or non-official Britisher or Indian, seriously suggest that a return to that scheme could be made, in defiance of all pledges and parliamentary encatment, without courting consequences too grave even for them to envisage?

- - - - -

October 25, 1924. **LEADER.**

## Is Dyarchy Curable?

The evidence of some of the witnesses before the Reforms Enquiry Committee shows how prejudice and personal disappointments may goad erstwhile Nationalists to self-stultifying courses. The public were perhaps prepared for the absorption of Messrs. Fazlul Huq, Ghuznavi and Kbiruddin Ahmad into the fold of the bureaucratic reactionaries. They would however have hardly been prepared for the surprising attitude that Sir Abdur Rahim, one of the most independent and distinguished Indians, one whose services in connection with the Islington Services Commission the whole country is grateful for, chose to take. Apparently the peculiar atmosphere of Bengal politics has choked even Sir Abdur Rahim out of his old mooring and compelled him to go more by prejudices than by principles. Sir Abdur Rahim expressed himself against any constitutional advance whatsoever before 1929. Not only that, he maintained that no transfers of further subjects were called for. When called upon to state how he would solve possible deadlocks that might arise, Sir Abdur Rahim pointed to remedy too facile to be safe. He will simply ruthlessly do away with whatever obstacles that may arise by the legislative resolution of those obstacles. If the Council was disposed to refuse Minister's salaries he would meet that danger by depriving the Council by Act of Parliament of the power of considering or granting their salaries. If again the legislature sought the aid of the courts to frustrake the continuance of dyarchy or a more immediate evil, he would have a law removing the proceedings of the Council from within the purview of the Courts. No matter what the means, he would make Dyarchy work. Lest the Ministers should be discontented he would free them from undue interference on the part of the Governors.

He would enforce "responsibility" by making Governors more or less a constructional head in relation to the Minister's departments and by not allowing official nominated members and Executive Councillors to vote on discussions of the transferred subjects. He would let the Minister depend upon the support of a majority among the elected Councillors." In other ways too Sir Abdur Rahim proposes to increase the powers of the Ministers. He would refuse to the Secretaries the right of access to the Governor at least in the transferred Governments. He would further introduce if necessary a separate purse for the transferred half.

These measures are no doubt calculated to enhance the powers and the prestige of the Ministers. But will they avail to resuscitate dyarchy? We do not think so. In the first place consider what the position will be of the Ministry in the Bengal Council itself. The Minister cannot, under Sir Abdur Rahim's arrangement, be deprived of his salary. But unless the Minister is capable of commanding an elective majority in the Council, it cannot get on for any length of time.

If the Ministers are deprived of the support of the official bloc, then, can they avoid defeat on a direct no-confidence motion when there is a working majority for the Swarajists and Independents' combination? A Ministry can avoid such a defeat only if it is able to satisfy popular wishes. But which Ministry under dyarchy can carry out such wishes, refused as it would be of adequate financial support from the reserved half? If it continues even after a vote of censure, or a defeat on a substantial issue, then the element of responsibility vanishes. On the other hand how can it placate popular wishes having no power to placate the same? In the second place, as Sir Abdur Rahim himself had to recognise, these can be no harmony bet the 2 halves of an executive one of which is of necessity dependent on a legislature hostile to the other half on which it is not dependent. By his power

of appointment of the Ministers, the Government may start with a harmonious etc., but since no man, not even the Minister, can serve two masters with opposing wills and inclinations, Ministers are bound to find themselves in conflict with their councils and their colleagues in the Government. In other words, dyarchy as modified by Sir Abdur Rahim's suggestions would in practice be considerably worse than dyarchy as it works under the present arrangement. As we stated yesterday it will precipitate almost hourly or daily deadlocks where there are now only sessional deadlocks.

The fact is that there is an element besides the bureaucracy, the Governor and his Ministers on whose will it is that the success of the whole thing depends. Men like Sir Abdur Rahim appear to imagine that a relatively feeble dam may be saved from the onrush of a torrential flood, every minute gathering mighty volume, by the one measure of opening up one or two sluices. They do not seem to have reckoned with the volume of public opinion in the country in favour of substantial reforms. Swarajists' usecking or defiant tactics in the council are possible only because of the strength of public opinion behind their back. So long as the operating factor in the Councils is an elected majority so long will the difficulty of deadlocks creep up again and again under dyarchy. That majority can either be ignored or overridden by force majeure but it cannot at once be defied and placated. If the intention of granting responsible Government be real, then, the best method of approaching the question does not surely lie in seeking to devise measures to strengthen the hands of autocracy or bureaucracy. The only method of making that intention effective is by applying democratic methods to the solution of the problem. What Sir Abdur Rahim and others have failed to see is that one cannot at once ignore public opinion and boast of having popularised the machinery of Government.

--:0:--

October 30, 1924: **LEADER:**

The official explanation for the refusal of permission to Mahatma Gandhi to proceed to Kohat is unconvincing. What is suggested is that if Mahatmaji goes to Kohat the Hindus will be provoked into making an agressive re-entry into the town in large numbers providing not only an irritant to local Muslims but also a potent cause for the influx of trans-border Muslims in support of their co-religionist on our side of the Indian Frontier. Mahatma Gandhi sent an effective reply to this suggestion which, it appears to the unsophisticated mind, ought to have given the quietus to it. Mahatma Gandhi stated that for from imposing an aggressive Hindu following on the town, he would let the Hindus return only if he succeeded in persuading the Muslim population that their return ought to be welcome to them. What he wanted to bring about was a settlement of the dispute and disharmony by consent and not a sham unity imposed from without which will be the less lasting the less it is based on the consent of both the parties. Lord Reading's reply to this explanation was unfortunately a firm though courteous preference of his own methods and his own dedision. Official action may establish peace, but at what greater cost will it have done so? The peace brought about by officials must be peace imposed on the people from without. Such a peace cannot be based on heart unity or reasoned conviction. In so far as it is not such a unity it is deemed to be built on sands and must lack that permanence which ought to be an essential attribute of real peace. We regret that Lord Reading failed to realise the potentialities of the sort of work which Mahatmaji had in view and of its vast superiority to official action. Why Lord Reading fights shy of the straight, courageous and sovereign path and prefers to meddle through his goal is more than we can say. Is there, we ask, a general law, a predestined one, that bureaucracy may function only through blunders?

..0..

November 2, 1924: 7 **LEADER:** 125

124 1864

<u>The Reforms Enquiry</u>

Whatever may be the truth regarding the suggestion that the Reforms Enquiry Committee of set purpose delayed its proceedings till after the results of the General Elections were announced, there is no doubt that it proceeded expeditiously when it suited it. Our special correspondent at Delhi refers to the way in which the Committee dealt with Lala Harikishenlal's request that he be re-examined in connection with Sir John Maynard's contradiction of many of his "facts", as well as his views. It is typical of the Committee's proceedings in general. The excuse that the Committee has broken up and hence could not hear Lala Harikishenlal is a pretext which will convince none. The Committee's last sitting was held too recently to let that excuse avail it, and in any case the Committee could not have finished writing its report. The fact that Sir Alexander Muddiman is agreeable to a memorandum being lodged by Lala Harikishenlal for the consideration of the Committee shows that the Lala's application to be heard again has not reached them too late for them to consider it. One or two more questions arise in this connection. The first is as who it is that arranged for the list of witnesses, especially the witnesses, official and pro-official, who somehow happened to be heard last. It will be interesting to know who sought the aid of those worthy members of "the steel frame", Mr. Marr, Mr. J.E.C. Jukes, Mr. Spence, Sir John Maynard and so on. Nor would it be of less interest to know if some attempts were not make to get somebody from the Bombay Secretariat to "contradict" Sir Chimmanlal Setalward and modify and "Correct" his statements which were so damaging to the bureaucracy. It is notorious that the fullest opportunity has been given to prop - up the totlering and shatlered case for the bureaucracy to all those who were interested in it or who were newly inspired to interest themselves in it. It is well-know, how at the time when the Montford enquiry was about to

commence its work, several associations and public bodies sprang into being like mushroom and each in its master's voice proclaimed the dangers of any constructional advance and especially the calamitous consequences that would follow the grant of substantial self-government. Nobody knew of their existence before the enquiry began and after it was over none heard of them again. Obviously they were the creatures of interested busy-bodies and were ignored as soon as they served their purpose. Since their selfish objective had been gained, they were ~~Indeed~~ indeed left to die by those whose mischievous activities gave them being. Who can deny but that in regard to some non-official witnesses before the Muddiman Committee, as well the same old story has been repeated? If the Reforms Enquiry Committee were anxious to have genuine Muslim views before it, it was easily to be had from the resolutions of Muslim public bodies, crystallised as they have been in the resolutions of the All-India Muslim League. The Committee, however, had little use for these apparently, for it took Mr. Kabiruddin Ahmad and his Parliamentary Muslim Party seriously and wasted--or did it Machiavelli--like spend?---a good deal of time and attention over them. Sir Alexander Muddiman was so anxious to placate or exploit Mr. Kabiruddin Ahmad that he coolly pocketed the insult offered to the Committee by this Muslim worthy, by his impertinent, supercilious and contemptuous refusal to be cross-examined by Sir P. Sivaswami Aiyar whom he had the check to refer to as a "two rupee pleader".

A section of the Committee--the dominant one at that--gave a free rein to witnesses of the stamp of Mr. Kabiruddin Ahmad and made the best use of them to support the bureaucracy's contentions that no constructional advance be taken for some more time to come. The evidence of some of the witnesses was taken in camera so that the public have no means of refuting it. When however an official witness came into the open and made statements to public which would not pass muster with those among the publicists who were in the know and when

an opportunity was requested to correct those statements, we are coolly told that such corrections may be suggested in a private memorandum to the Committee which it may or may not take note of it and, even if it takes note of it, it cannot do so effectively. One question that arises in this connection is: Did the President consult colleagues before refusing Lala Harikishenlal's request to be recalled and re-examined? If he did not, why? The whole enquiry, in fact, has been carried out in a thoroughly unsatisfactory way. Evidence has been let in, not so as to arrive at the real facts and the remidies for the defects, but so as to prejudice the case for re-consideration of the reform question in a way calculated to satisfy Indian public opinion. The failure to reckon Indian public opinion into account is a fatal defect in the proceedings of the Committee. How then can its recommendations satisfy the country?

--:0:--

November 14, 1924: 127 LEADER 128 1870

## What will the Liberals Do?

Dr. Taj Bahadur Sapru's suggestion that a small committee of the representatives of all parties should be appointed to discuss the question connected with our political future is a welcome and significant reminder to the country that without united action on the part of all parties in the country little that is useful could be accomplished. Nobody has in recent days worked harder or more earnestly to achieve such a unity than the leaders of the Congress, the Swarajists no less than the no-changers. The Calcutta Conference was indeed meant to exploit all possible ways to bring about a re-union among the parties and the holding of a united Congress at Belgaum this December. Everything was done at that conference to make the path easy for the other parties to join the national organisation and proclaim from its platform the views of united India.

Every endeavour was made prior to the holding of that conference to ascertain the difficulties of the other parties in rejoining the Congress. The viewws expressed by Liberal Leaders and the comments of the Liberal press on the move for unity were carefully scanned and considered as to get at their difficulties and it was found that on but two points did they experience difficulty. They were opposed to National Congress on principle and they wished that the rigours of the spinning franchise should be relaxed. The Calcutta Conference fully did away with these difficulties. It agreed to give up National Congress and it so modified the spinning franchise as to make it easy for any one to accept it without the least mental or physical difficulty. The leaders of the Congress having gone so long away to satisfy the other parties in the country, it is but reasonable to expect of the other parties an effort to make the united Congress an unqualified success.

We regret to notice, however, that there is a tendency in certain quarters to raise fresh difficulties and vague apprehensions. We are told that what the Calcutta compact has done is to invite non-Swarajists to rejoin the Congress only "to be tied to the Swarajist charriot-wheel". We are afraid this sort of criticism is the result of letting one's vague suspicions getting the better of one's sound instincts. The Bengalee takes up this unfortunate attitude. "These with whom", it says "the Congress has always been and still is a political organisation, will hardly find it possible to continue in and come back to the Congress under the absolute Swarajist regime, which the Mahatma has helped to establish unless they are willing to sign the Swarajist bond". "This compact", our contemporary goes on to observe, "commits the Congress absolutely to the Swarajist policy and programme. But whatever our Swarajist friends may say, the country has not fully accepted that policy and programme. The Liberals or the Moderates have not and will never sign the Swarajist bond. They will never agree to the Swarajist policy of persistent and consistent obstruction. They will not subscribe to the Swarajist pledge of not accepting office either as Ministers or otherwise co-operating with the Government". That these fears are founded on a serious misapprehension of the nature of this compact will be evident of the Bengalee's interpretation of the effects thereof. "The Gandhi-Swarajist compact says that so far as work in the provincial and Central legislatures is concerned", our contemporary remarks, "the Swarajya party shall act for, and in the name of, the Congress. It means that the Congress will not have any politics apart from or independent of what may from time to time be the Swarajist policy or programme.

On the face of it, the arrangement is outrageous. It means that a limb shall control and direct the Body, the tail shall wag the Dog". The above interpretation of the Joint Manifesto, it need hardly be said, is grossly unjust to the

signatories thereto. Neither the terms of the Manifesto nor its numerous commentaries provided by its authors are capable of bearing such an interpretation. It is true that the Swarajya Party under the Manifesto has been given the fullest powers over the formulation and conduct of its policy inside the Councils. But what the critics of the manifesto overlook is the fact that these powers are given not for tyrannising over either Liberals or any other party, but for the definite purpose of healing the existing schisms. The Preamble distinctly states that "the country is divided into different groups seemingly working in opposite directions, and because "such antagonistic activity retards the progress of the nation towards Swarajya" "it is desirable to bring so far as possible all such parties within the congress and on a common platform". It proclaims moreover that "it has become a matter of immediate necessity to invite and secure the co-operation of all parties for putting forth the united strength of the nation against the policy of repression".

It is in pursuance of these objects that the Swarajists have been charged with the duty of looking after the Council activities. It is clearly not for them to tyrannise over or impose their particular policy on unwilling parties. Pandit Motilal Nehru in an interview the other day distinctly stated what the Swarajists mean to do. His view of the powers vested in his party under the Joint Manifesto is unambiguous. "The Joint Statement", he remarked, "leaves it to the Swarajya party to make its own rules and I shall indeed be surprised if it is unable to find a common ground with other Nationalists in the Legislatures". The Swarajists are charged with the duty of achieving agreement among the pro-council parties and not of perpetuating disagreement. They have already achieved much by way of arriving at working arrangements with the Liberals and the Independents in the past and it is now their duty to place the past understandings and conventions on a firmer basis, evolve principles of action agreeable to both and put them into operation as occasion arises. The Liberals therefore need

have no apprehensions on this score. What the Congress is asked to do at Belgaum is to find out a basis of common agreement. The leaders of Congress aim at bringing all parties within the Congress and on a common platform to discuss the country's future and formulate policies and programmes action acceptable to all. The Joint Committee representing all parties, the appointment of which Sir Tej Bahadur suggests, will thus be most appropriately appointed by the Congress at Belgaum. Such a Committee appointed by a united congress, a national organisation, representing all and voicing forth the best aspirations of the people, will carry a weight which no self-appointed committee of individual politicians can hope to do. We hope Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru will recognise the force of this fact, rejoin the Congress and lead liberal opinion inside it and work for and arrive at an agreed programme.

--:0:--

132

1878

November 15, 1924: **LEADER**

131

The action of the Government in depriving the Dindigul Municipal Council of the privilege of electing its own chairman, notified in this week's Gazette, has naturally provoked the resentment of some of the self-respecting Councillors and moved them to tender their resignation of their memberships. There is no gainsaying the fact that the Council has been for some time past the scene of petty passions and personal jealousies which tended to hamper business and smooth working in that body. It would even appear that in May last some of the irresponsible Councillors played obstructive tactics on the occasion of the election of the Chairman and a suit is pending in the sub-court as a sequel to this. Without waiting for the decision in the suit or ascertaining the particular persons responsible for the mischief and taking action against them, the Government have hurriedly passed judgment against the whole Council and deprived them of their precious privilege of electing their own chairman. The Council as a whole is thus unfairly punished for the irresponsible action of a few misguided councillors. We wonder how this step will help to improve the situation and purge the Council of its evil elements. It will only serve to drive out conscientious and self-respecting members from that body and thus make it less serviceable to the rate-payers.

--:0:--

November 18, 1924. LEADER

## The Swarajists as Untouchables

No item of the Calcutta Pact has met with such fierce criticism from quarters whose enthusiasm for unity and the prestige of the Congress is now as perfervid as it is of recent birth, than the one which gives the official imprimatur to the Swarajists' conciliar activities. To judge by the variety and vehemence of these critical voices, one would think that the Swarajists' sins had found them out and that they had become a sort of political untouchables. We have already pointed out that these criticisms where they are not captious are based on imaginary apprehensions. The suspension of the national congress programme must necessarily involve modifications in that of the Swarajists and Pandit Motilal Nehru has in a statement of sweet reasonableness already made this clear. If objections still continue they must be due to any one of 3 reasons. Firstly, the name Swarajist may be an unhallowed one in view of past record and the intense disfavour with which even friendly British opinion regards it. Secondly, its leading personalities may get on the sensitive nerves of the leaders of the parties to an extent that makes national congress with them a sacred duty. Thirdly, the Swarajist programme may be regarded with suspicion. It is not our purpose here to hold a brief for the Swarajists. We do however think that these timorous hesitations disguise too completely the patriotic determination of the dissenters to rise above party squabbles and unite to meet the common danger. If there is a danger of one party or one programme crowding out the others, the obvious thing to do is to grasp your nettle boldly and try to influence that party in the right direction by taking cousel with it for the common good. It is not by treating it as an Ishamel in the political wilderness that a party of its importance and undoubted following in the country can be brought to a correct frame of mind. We note

that at the recent Tamil Nadu Conference the point was raised by the stern covenanters of the no-change party that the Swarajists should not be accorded official recognition but that the Congress should confine itself to the constructive programme leaving it free for all the parties, Liberals, No-changers, Non-Brahmans, etc., to follow their own programmes. How far a fraternal desire to chasten the errant Swarajists inspired this plea for making the Congress a sort of caravanserai for political parties we shall not enquire. In the speeches supporting this no-change amendment some play appears to have been made with the gravity of the Brahmin- non-Brahmin controversy here. Its resuscitation when it had practically lost much of its bitterness at the present time is a matter for regret and we hope that those who raised the communal bogey were inspired more by a zeal for the non-Brahmin cause than by a desire to use it tactically. In any case the no-changers who sponsored the amendment apparently did not recognise that what they proposed would have the effect of reducing the Congress into a harmless non-entity to whom everybody paid lip homage and then with their tongues in their cheek went on their various and sometimes devious courses. What is needed now is a political programme for the Congress to which all parties are agreed and all parties will work with the enthusiasm inspired by the knowledge that they have behind them the prestige and popularity of this great national institution. Surely the crisis is grave enough for us to eschew small-souled jealousies and tactical considerations!

--:o:--

November 19, 1924: **LEADER**

## The Claims of the Depressed Classes

More than one question in the Madras Legislative Council yesterday dealt with the treatment of the depressed classes in the villages and their right of entry into streets occupied by higher castes. A series of supplementary questions also followed with a view to force the Government to make its position clear to the Council. The adjournment motion which was disallowed by the President was also on a serious incident which arose out of the exercise of the right of entry into such streets by a section of the depressed class community in Palghat. These minor episodes along with the fight that is still going on at Vaikom, indicate that the lower classes have begun to grow restless under the many disabilities they are now suffering from and that they are out to win their human rights and equality of treatment with the higher classes. It is nothing short of a mighty social upheaval that is now a foot in the country. Although its beginnings are now but slow and the rumblings of its motion only dimly heard, there is no doubt that it will gather increasing force and volume in future. Hence it is the part of wisdom and statesmanship to awake in time to the gravity of the situation, approach the movement seriously and with sympathy and try to arrive at a solution which will do full justice to the now depressed classes without violating the reasonable rights of the rest of the community. The Congress by its propaganda and programme regarding the removal of untouchabilit under the inspiration and guidance of Mahatmaji, has done much pioneer work and pointed out a practical way for the elevat and amancipation of the depressed classes.

The method of direct action through Satyagraha may not acceptable to all parties, and may even be deemed unnecessary in places where much can be done by legislative action, or non-official negotiation and arbitration. It is therefore

time that the Government, the legislative council and other public bodies outside the Congress, should begin to tackle the various questions arising out of the rights of the depressed classes and prevent any untoward incident like the one at Palghat, by amicably arriving at settlements acceptable to all parties. The voice of humanity and justice being on the side of our untouchable brethren there is, happily, a practical unanimity of opinion regarding the reasonableness of some of their claims on principle and the necessity for fulfilling their demand for social justice. But there is a large and in some places serious difference of opinion regarding the extent and the nature of the rights to be immediately conceded to them. The difficulties of settlement are also enhanced by the absense of any definite legal provisions governing the questions at issue and the various in the customs and traditions in the several parts of the Presidency. The whole question is a rather delicate one and requires considered treatment. The appointment of committees of leaders and the influential men of the various communities whose rights and interests conflict, will go a long way to clarify the issues, adjust the mutual claims and help the parties to arrive at a settlement or the government finally take legislative action. The depressed classes have many channels of peaceful and constructional action open to them to press their claims and establish the validity of their rights in the eyes of law and public opinion. It will be wis for them to exhaust these methods before resorting to sterner ones. In the meantime the Government and the legislatures w be committing a grievous and suicidal folly if they show any tendency to shirk the problem and unduly postpone its consideration.

--:O:--

November 22, 1924: **LEADER**

## The Bombay Leaders' Conference

The Conference of Leaders at Bombay has apparently made a good start. Despite opposition from a small section, opposition based evidently on a misapprehension, Mahatma Gandhi's resolution to refer the question of Bengal Ordinance to a Committee representing all parties was carried. That Committee has reported on the terms of the resolution to be passed by the Conference at its plenary session. The test of the draft resolution prepared by the Committee will be found elsewhere. It leaves no room for doubt as to what the country thinks of the Ordinance and of the methods which Government are employing to deal with revolutionary crime. The Ordinance was condemned outright as affecting the liberty of the subject and a demand made that those now kept in jail under the Ordinance and Regulation III should either be released forthwith or brought to trial before regular courts. Mrs. Besant, of course, dissented from these views, but her views on this particular matter are universally considered peculiar and as such need not be treated seriously. There seems to be some confusion of issues as to the scope of the Conference. Some of the delegates seem to have thought that the subject to be discussed was only the possibilities of a united Congress. This is obviously a mistake. The Conference had two questions to consider, first whether and what kind of united and simultaneous action should be taken by the various parties in the country to meet the Bengal situation, and secondly, whether and on what terms the National Congress could once again be made a latter question is quite independent of the former. What was disposed of yesterday was the former question in regard to which the Conference Committee agreed that the Government should be asked to restore the rule of law and told that Swaraj was the best cure for the present unpleasant situation. The larger question is yet to be discussed which discussion will probably take place to-day.

November 24, 1924 LEADER

## The Bombay Conference.

There is a homely adage which suggests the unwisdom of premature jubilation. In the case of the Bombay Conference there will be little need for its appreciation, though it may safely be said that it has paved the way to the attainment of that unity which all parties have at heart. The All-Party Conference, it must be remembered, met in an atmosphere of chastened pessimism. The air had so lately been full on the eve of its meeting with warnings and gloomy prognostications from Liberal leaders whose patriotism flowered into diatribes in the columns of the Anglo-Indian press that it was evident that a deliberate 11th hour attempt was being made to stampede the more progressive of the Liberal leaders like Mr. Sastri and Mr. Chintamani into an attitude of intransigence. They were reminded of the fate of the too optimistic young lady of Riga and warned of the risk they were running in walking into the Swarajist trap. How little justified these lurid anticipations were will become obvious on a perusal of the actual proceedings, for there was nothing in these that could cause the most timorous or the most suspicious of a party constitutionally prone to ~~hesit~~ hesitancy a moment's heart-searching. The tone and temper of the discussions were generally speaking admirable and this we should like to emphasise because later we may take occasion to criticise the position taken up by certain speakers. There was obviously a general appreciation of the gravity of the position and a general desire to display a spirit of mutual accommodation. The Conference passed two resolutions, both framed in a spirit of admirable catholicity. The first one condemned the Bengal Ordinance in no uncertain terms but by confining the criticism to its effect without treading of the controversial quagmire of motive, a unanimity of support

was reached which ought to convey a unmistakable message to the authorities in India and in England. That was all the more necessary because there have lately been indications that once again an attempt may be made to resuscitate the policy of rallying the Moderates and it is not fanciful to perceive in Sir Chimanlal's recent splenetice outburse a preliminary attempt at lustration in readiness for that process. What any Government in the temper that prevails at Simla and White hall can offer that any self-respecting Liberal can accept is a dark mystery to us and we are therefore glad that the progressive wing of the Liberal Party has refused to partake in the process of separating the sheep from the goats. They had little enough to do so far in the Conference they were accorded the seat of honour and a deference was paid to their wishes that must have been particularly gratifying to them. There is nothing in this for cavil or surprise for with the practical dimination of national congress as a working programme on orientation towards the constructional methods advocated by the Liberals was inevitable. So far has this developed that we notice that a prominent Congress leader of Tamil Nadu now advocates a policy of Responsive National Congress. It may be surmised that this apparent contradiction in terms has been adopted as antipathelic to the harrowed feelings of National Congress than the label of Responsive Co-operation. However that may be there is no justification to apprehend untoward consequences and to use words like "surrender" to Liberals in this connection is to employ the terminology of mischief. After all the Liberalism that we have had to find fault with in the past, is not a policy but a frame of mind. It is quite as possible for a professing Liberal to be progressive as it is for a professing No-changer to be an obscruantist. And so long as it is inspiring enough to be a binding force and energetic enough to make an impression on our opponents there is nothing in any creed to fight shy of

because it emanates from a Liberal. It was wise of the Conference therefore to appoint a Committee to explore the possibilities of a common programme and we are sure, give a certain amount of self-abnegation on the part not only of persons but also of parties, such a common programme is easy of attainment. The real danger will come in when the question of its prosecution develops but given the spirit that pervaded this Conference we do not anticipate any untoward developments in this direction. It was unfortunate, though it would be unduly pessimistic to regard it as ominous, that the general urbanity of the proceedings was marred in certain instances. It was a task of superogation for one speaker to seek to amend the first resolution by including in the commination against the anarchists also those who did not make their existence impossible. After all what satisfied Mr. Sastri may well have satisfied Mr. Joseph and the unfortunate result of his trying to be more Royalist than the King was a repetition in a more or less expurgated form the baleful controversy over the Serajganje resolution. These little ripples, apart however, it may be claimed that the Confrence went off very well and has constituted a substantial first step towards the achievement of national unity. For this result the resolve of all parties--Congress, Liberals Besantites and non-Brahmins--to place patriotism before party has been responsible. That has opened a vista of glorious possibilities and it is the sacred duty of all parties to see that the atmosphere of the Conference also pervades their every day political life, for it is in that crucible that the pious resolves of moments of exaltation are put to their most searching test.

--:0:--

November 29, 1924: **LEADER**

## Future of Indian States

The future of the Indian States is a problem which as the days go by must receive more and more attention from publicists and politicians. The political advance of ~~our~~ Br India must, as the authors of the Montford reforms recognised, have its inevitable reaction on the Indian States. The reaction in fact has already begun. The peoples in the Native States see across their frontiers a higher level of political advance with a promise of further progress in not far-off days, and naturally desire similar constitutional changes in their own states. The wise Ruler will appreciat this popular awakening and harness it for the purposes of better administration. Not all of our Princes and chiefs, however, have imagination enough to evaluate it in the proper manner. A small number of them have attempted to recognise the awakening of the people and given make-believe constructions but the great majority of our Princes would appear to prefer the continuance of personal, autocratic rule in spite of the contiguity to the changes occur in British India. How to reconcile the ~~xxxx~~ ambitious Pri with the aspirations of their people is a problem which mu call for solution before long. And the corollary problem o adjusting the relations of the States with ~~with~~ the Britis Indian Government or governments must likewise be faced. Neither the provincial Governments nor the Government of I seem to be willing to tackle this problem. The viceroy i the course of his address this week in Kathiawar referre certain aspects of the Native States' problems and from remarks it does not seem that he is in any way eager to arrive at a wise settlement. He would appear willing to facilitate the permanence of autocratic Rule. Addressing

Princes at the Rajkot banquet, he said:- "You need not fear that transference from the control of the Government of Bombay implies any alteration of arrangements hitherto existing. Changes will no doubt come, for all institutions must move to meet new conditions, but none affecting your position or privileges can ever receive my approval or concurrence without the fullest regard being paid to local sentiment and feeling". This passage leaves no doubt that as bet princes and peoples the Government of India will side with the former rather than with the latter. And the Conservative Government also may be expected, as the Maharaja of Bikaneer said recently in an interview to formulate a policy so as "to meet the legitimate aspirations and cherished ambitions of the Princes". In fact, the transference of control of the Indian States from the Provinces to the Central Government is in itself a clear indication of the Government's policy. With the provinces in a position of so-called constitutional Government it would be anamalous for them to be linked up with natives ruled under the code of the personal despot. The proper course to adopt in the citcumstances would have been to bring pressure on the princes and chiefs to raise the political level in their States to that of the contiguous British Indian area. Instead of that, the Government transferred the control of the States to Delhi, thus indirectly expressing their sympathy with the desire of the Princes to perpetuate the reign of autocracy. The fraterising with autocracy has created another problem concerning the Indian States. The distance of Delhi from most of the States naturally makes it necessary to invest the Political Agent with more powers and the presence of a Political Agent with uncontrolled powers is very often, not merely a source of annoyance to the States, but a heavy drag on whatever little independence still remains to them. The inconvenience can be removed only by more exact definition and adjustment of the relations of th States with British India.

December 2, 1924: **LEADER:**

For a "great and good man" Lord Lytton's actions seem strongly at variance with his professions. One wonders, for example, what particular service he was rendering to "the land of his birth" by his latest order depriving Mr. Subash Chandra Bose of the privilege of transacting his official business from jail. The explanation that the privilege was only a temporary one pending the appointment of a successor smacks too much of spite to permit of its unqualified acceptance. It will be asked, was it the main idea of the arrest to deprive the Corporation of the services of its Executive officer? Apparently Lord Lytton feels insulted that one on whom his dis-pleasure has been visited should continue to be exalted by the Corporation. That is natural but it does not square with the commonly accepted ideas of fair play. To deprive a man of his liberty by a mere executive fiat is serious enough. To refuse permit him a certain amount of circumscribed activity in a sphere which is remote from any possible association with anachronism appears to us the height of melancholy meanness. Apparently the ethical code even of misunderstood archangels does not exclude the giving of a dog a bad name with view to its eventual execution.

--:0:--

December 6, 1924: **LEADER**

## The Government and the Lee Commission

The communique published elsewhere announcing the decisions of His Majesty's Government in respect of certain of the recommendations of the Lee Commission, does not exactly run on the lines of the forecast of those decisions. His Majesty's present Government are too cautious--Tories that they are of the bluest blood--to accept even these recommendations off-hand and at a stroke lest, of course, they should in future be in found in parts to be more favourable to Indians than they intended they should be. They have therefore refused to accept the Lee Commission's attitude of "take all or leave all". We do not think the Lee Commissioners, not xxyx at any rate the European section of them, will be dissatisfied with this decision to overthrow their own formula and the "Pioneer's" commentary thereon that the whole Report is in the nature of a treaty and should be accepted as a whole. For, their formula was fashioned for a Labour Government in which they had no confidence that it will swallow their pill without a sugar coating and they imagined that the best way to take the pill in was to sugar-coat it and say that it could not have the sugar without taking the pill. The "Pioneer" too developed its treaty theory because it had no faith in Labour and was willing to make a small sacrifice to gain its vital point. Had these people known that the Report would be disposed of not by a Labour Government, but a Tory Government, we doubt if they would have taken up their up "leave all or take all" attitude. Not that they lose much thereby, now that they are being saved by from their folly by an obliging superior Government. For it is a mistake to suppose that the decisions of His Majesty's Government mean to India everything that the Lee Report promised. For the moment, where His Majesty's Government have rejected or modified the Lee recommendations, they have done so ostensibly in favour

of India. That is in relation to the enhancement of pensions and exchange compensation in regard to overseas pay. But that is nothing by the side of placing these allowances beyond the pale of "India's ~~Parliament~~ Parliament" Nor is it any consolation to be told that the recommendations of the Commission in regard to Indianisation and control over the services are "generally" accepted. At best this pace of Indianisation and the measure of control mean little. Above all, it is not a little suspicious that in regard to some of the most important chapters, Chaper III, for example, relating to the Medical Services, His Majesty's Government are not very eager to pronounce an opinion. Anglo-India has made a dead-set against the "killing" of the I.M.S. and we cannot expect a die-hard Government to ignore its veto. That explains why in regard to "other proposals" than those disposed of in the communique, the consideration of the report has not been complete.

--:O:--

December 12, 1924: **LEADER**

Not a little of suspicious stage-management seems to be going in the Punjab in connection with the new piece of legislation to settle the Gurdwara struggle. The Government have attempted more than once, but in vain, to bring a bill which will satisfy all sections of the sikhs and settle the dispute. Prestige thus stands in the way of its again making an attempt which cannot succeed unless it concedes the demands of the Akalis or undermines their influence and moral strength in the community. But the Government seems to be nevertheless, interested in ending the struggle, for it involves as much strain on them and loss of repuration as it involves suffering on the Akalis. Sir Malcolm Hailey is now engaged in this difficult task of accomplishing this feat without loss of prestige to the Government.

And in the Sikh Sudhar Committee he seems to have found a convenient body through which he can work to counter-act the influence of the Aklis. Hence we can understand his solicitude for this body and its work, which he has expressed in his reply to a deputation from that body which appears in our telegraphic columns. His Excellency in the course of his reply observed:-

"We have not encouraged one section of a community in an agitation injurious to the interests of another. Your aim is Gurdwara reform. Your critics admit no other objective. Surely, we are entitled to support those whose declared policy is to seek that objective by lawful and reasonable methods. We find the whole community troubled and distraught. We saw that one section was seeking a remedy by the normal and civilised course of legislation. We instructed our officers to use their influence to find out that there existed somewhere men with reasonable views who have courage of their convictions. It is disturbing to them (Akalis) to find that

these are still some who can express a belief in the sincerity of the Government. It is disheartening (for them) to discover that there are those who question their autocracy over a misdirected following but that does not prove that it was improper for us to support you and the vigour of their vituperation must afford you a refreshing proof that their dis-like is combined with some feeling of desperation"-

--:O:--

December 13, 1924: **Leader** -147- 1910

There is one point in connection with the filling up of vacancies of the Executive Council of the Governor-General and Governors which ought not to be lost sight of. The intention of the framers of the Government of India Act in prescribing the qualification for members is clear. Orginally it was laid down that at least two of the members of the Governor's Executive Council should be men with service qualifications. The Act of 1919 modified the stipulation about the obligatory entertainment of service men and stated that it would be enough if one of the members was a service man. The principles underlying these changes in the constitution are that the service element should be reduced and that non-official Indian element should be increased. The service element, the Joint Committee contemplated further, should as far as possible be Indianised. That is to say there was a movement towards Indianising these bodies as much as possible and Indianisation was to proceed both in the service element as well as in the non-official element. It is noteworthy that while the Act fixed a minimum of seats on these bodies for the statutory native of India, it did no such thing as regards the European element. It follows from these facts that while the official experience of Indians was to be utilised, it was to be utilised to fill up vacancies in the service element of the Executive Council and that in principle, the non-service element which it was contemplated should grow as days went on, should be composed of Indians, rich in experience as non-official publicists and as such had been in the most intimate contact with public opinion. We hope the Governor-General and the Governors of Provinces will bear these points in mind when making appointments to the Executive Councils. Indians with official experience have a place on these bodies under the constitution, but that place ought to be on the seats allotted to the Services. It is a highly retrograde step to fill up vacancies in the non-service section

of the council with ex-bureaucrats, however qualified they might be for a seat on the service section of the Council.

December 18, 1924: LEADER

## The Present Situation

There are two or three facts in the present situation to which we think it necessary to call the attention of the leaders who will be called upon in the next few days to formulate a national policy and programme for the coming year. For one thing, they must remember that when Col. Wedgwood says that it is the Councils and not the Congress that now count, it is a statement which we cannot afford to dismiss lightly. That statement, coming as it does from a member of His Majesty's late Government, must be understood as throwing some light on the Government's view of the situation. The Government appears to think that the Congress has lost, if not its prestige, at any rate its influence and that what it should do now to achieve its aims is simply to break its power by rallying such sections of the population in India as it thinks may be brought round by a few insignificant concessions. The trend of its recent policy seems to show that that policy is one of rallying the minority communities--the Sikhs and and Muslims.

This policy was advocated and is being advocated in the columns of the British Press. It was pointed out that the most serious factor in the Indian situation was the discontent of the Sikhs and of the Muslims and that the Government should make peace with these classes if it is to retain its hold on the country. Everything points to the fact that this policy is now being put into force by the Government. It finds expression in Sir Malcolm Hailey's Sikh policy in the Punjab. He at any rate has not thought it necessary to disguise the fact that his policy is one of rallying the "moderate" Sikhs. Sir Valentine Chirol, writing to the *Times* the other day, advocated a similar policy towards Muslims. The special encouragement given to the Hug-Ghuznavi Clique in Bengal and the attempts, which, thanks to the good sense of

151 150 1916



Bengal Muslims, have so far failed, to set up a Bengal Muslim party to undermine the influence of the Swarajists, there, is an aspect of this policy. The influence of the same policy can be discerned in the Government of India Resolution on the Kohat tragedy. The welcome that is accorded in England to the propaganda of Dr. Ziauddin is another significant fact.

The Government's view seems to be that it has only generously to concede the Muslim claims in regard to communal representation on the representative bodies and on the services to win the community's support for its reactionary policy. It is to be said to the credit of Muslim leaders of influence that they have not so far expressed anything calculated to show that their objective is selfish and not patriotic. The bureaucracy is however not in any way tired of its efforts in which indeed it continues to persist. Unless, therefore, we are able to put forward a united, national policy, our efforts would not be attended with that success which we seek. We daresay the Muslim leaders will see to it that national unity is not marred by any unreasonable action on their part. The responsibility of other parties and leaders is not less great. The nation, they could not forget, is now in the throes of a grave crisis. Freedom of person of the subject is being denied in Bengal and the "rule of law" does not obtain there in all cases. What is Bengal's lot to-day may be the lot of other provinces to-morrow. The Reforms on which some leaders counted much have proved a failure and the reply of the Government to a national demand that they be liberalised is action in the direction of withdrawing the reforms. The country unanimously feels that these constitute grave injustices done to it. Is it not the duty of the leaders to respect this universal feeling? How can they better respect it by presenting a united front and with one voice proclaiming that they can no longer telerate reaction?

--:0:--

22nd December, 1924: LEADER

## The Reforms Enquiry

Although the exact recommendations of the Reforms Enquiry Committee are not known, the fact that the Report is not to be a unanimous document has led the public to draw certain inferences. The lack of unanimity in the Committee can be due to one fact only, the fact, namely, that the official members of the Committee and their friends, who appear to constitute the mojarity, are against any advance over the present state of things. The exact grounds on which they base their conclusions are not known, but from the trend of the examination of the witnesses from the reactionary point of view, it is permissible to infer that their grounds are that the people of India have no political back-ground, that they are not competent to exercise their votes properly, that it is only the "agitator class" that wants the reforms and that, in the circumstances no more constitutional progress is either desirable or possible. The official clique seems to hold that the people are neither prepared for, nor are ready to assume, further civic and political responsibilities. To pass off this gratuitous assumption on their part as an authoritative interpretation of the people's mind is a task which doubtless considerable audaciousness, but few will be surprised if the Muddiman Committee (the majority of course) have assumed that responsibility. Such an inference is not only legitimate, but is also confirmed by the Delhi letters depicting the Committee's doings, desires and difficulties, which have from time to time, appeared in the Anglo-Indian Press. Whether the people have had political training on democratic lines and whether they are prepared to shoulder further responsibilities, are not matters of opinion. They are matters of fact. So is the statement that the masses are opposed to what

the classes demand and that the latter's demands are essentially self-seeking ones. In regard to the first charge, history records our achievements through democratic institutions and that surely is more authoritative testimory than the ipse-dixits of interested busy bodies. In his speech at Berhampur which we publish to-day Sir A.P. Patro examines this point at length. He, of course, deals with the subject in connection with the problems he is immediately interested in, rural education and rural reconstruction, but the point he brings out, namely, that in ancient days and till comparatively recent days, India enjoyed a system of self-Government based on universal branchise and elected officials not on theocratic or communal lines, but on perfectly democratic lines, is of importance in this connection. The democratic Indian Institutions were doubtless gradually wiped out of existence, since the advent of the British and their highly centralised administrative machinery; but the democratic tradition still persists in the more remote of our villages and one has only to remove the incubus of the superinposed bureaucratic despotism to-let it live again and flourish. The argument therefore that India lacks the necessary democratic foundations to make the representative institutions a success cannot hold good. Nor is the other argument that the classes work up the agitation in their selfish-interests and that the interests of the masses are opposed to those of the classes any the more sound. One has only to go through the proceedings of the various Indian legislatures to see how the educated classes, the representatives of the people have ever set the interests of the masses above everything else. The reforms they have suggested in their interpellations and the demands they have made in their resolutions will show how most of them relate to the welfare of the people at large and how earnest and genuine their endeavours are to ameliorate the condition of the masses.

If then as is to be feared the Muddiman Committee seek to make out that no reforms need be granted because the masses neither need them nor stand to benefit by them, the above facts must make it clear how untrue their premises are and how egregiously absured their infeences.

file no 17. 154 | 936

Jan. 8. 1925. (Hindu 1925)

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

SUMMARY:-

In a course of an interview by our representative Mr. C.F.Andrews described the present situation in South Africa in deeply distressing terms as the last straw of oppression which will break the camel's back. He was simply surprised at the complete change of labour displayed by the Labour Party in the Colony and feared that all hopes of a Round Table Conference raised by Mrs. Sarojini Devi were vanishing. The Conference raised by Mrs. same gloomy view is taken by Mr. Joshi, a prominent member of the Indian Community in Transvaal, on the eve of his return to the colony after Six months sojourn in this country. In the course of an interview to the Chronicle, Mr. Joshi fears that if the present policy of inaction in this country, both on the part of the Government and the public men, continue the Union Government will drive ~~drive~~ Indians out bag and baggage from South Africa He pleads for the convening of an overseas conference without delay to ventilate the grievancies of Indian Overseas and protest against the attitude of whites and determine Indians's policy towards the dominions, colonies and protectrates. Such a Conference lacking set right the wrongs but it will certainly help to clarify and focus our ideas on the questions to be solved and educate public opinion here and abroad in a better manner than at present.

- - - -

1555

1938



Jan.16.1925.

## INDIANS IN CEYLON.

SUMMARY.

The Honàble Mr. Muhammad Sultan of Ceylon enumerates the grievances of the Indian residents of ceylon as follows:- Indian emigrants are subjected to vexations and not a little humiliating "scruitny" at the Mantapam Camp by the officers of Ceylon under the guise of protecting the colony from the entry into into it of pest bearing and inpecurious undesirables from India........ The Economic condition of Indian labour in Ceylon is another, if anything more serious grievance Not even the most enthusiastic supporter of the plenter puts the earnings of the Indian labourer very high. The ceylon has taken up this question. As that shows that Ceylonese are not unwilling to consider and remedy a grievance where it exists.A third greivance of the Indian residents in Ceylon is that they are inadequately represented on the legislatures and that therefore their intrests are not properly safeguarded. Not only but the rules regarding franchise and their electorate impose additional handicaps on them. Mr. Sultan also enumerates ~~sundry~~ some other disabilities under which also the Indians in Ceylon are labouring. In regard to political rights, in so far as the Indians are not mere birds of passage in so far that is as they are prepared to shoulder the responsibilities as well as the priveleges of the citizenship so far the claims of Indian to ~~xxxxxx~~ considerate treatment rest on a sound basis. If Indians desire a fair treatment we cannot see how the Ceylonese the Singalese the Tamils and the Burghers included could refuse it to them. Let the Indians who have made Ceylon their home conduct themselves as citizens of ceylon devoted to the welfare of ceylon and then ultimately their rights to equality are bound to be recognised by the Ceylonese no less heartily than by others. There is an Indian Agent

in Colony but it does not appear he has been able to do much. We in India are optimistic that justice will ere long prevail. That is not to say, however that we should keep quiet. Far from it we should watch developments carefully.

- - - -

157 1942

Jan.22.1925.

THE VICEROY AND INDIAN OVERSEAS.

We are not surprised that Lord Reading's references to the pesition of Indians overseas have evoked a spirited protest from the Rt. Hon. V.S.Srinivasa Sastri. For the those references constitute a black betrayal of the interests of the Indian residents, not only in Kenya but also in the various other parts of the Empire. With that Callous blindness to the realities of the situation Lord Reading far from being distressed at the results of the decisions of the colonial office congratulates the committee on these resuts. It is of no account to him that on every crucial point the India office has been obliged to give in. In regard to franchise to segregation and to immigration. In regard to the first two of these the failure is a definite and procláimed one. In the matter of the third what has happened is that hostile action has been decided on but will not be undertaken till the occasion for it arises in a clearly recognisable form. The only "concession" that has been shown to India is the offer of some God forsaken patches of land which may be exploited by Indians to the benefit ultimately may be of the whites. It is these decisions that Lord Reading refers to "as substantial gains." Lord Reading's reference to our loss of equality as "substantial gains" sounds like a cruel mockery. His prayer that the South African question might be settled along the lines of the kenya question is an insist to this country. Mr. Sastri has uttered a timely warning to the public against acquiesing in the Government of Indias proposal foreshadowed in the Viceroy's speech to appoint an Indian officer to investigate the areas in the low lands of kenya for exclusive occupation of Indians as a sort of compensation for their being shut out of the High lands. Mr. Sastri traces the history of the proposal

158 1944



which has been denounced by the press and public men in India "as avait which should be avoided and a bribe which should be unhesitatingly rejected". We hope his appeals We the members of the Assembly and the council of state to take steps to press on the Government the public view in regard to the question will not face on deaf ears Although there is not much left of achieving a settlement to the satisfaction of Indians there is no reason, as Mr. Sastri rightly points out why India should by voluntary action of hers seem to accept a principle a involving a stigma on her nationals."

 1BG. 1946

Jan.24.1925.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Summary:- South Africa is fast developing a cast system of the worst type. The Union Governmnent is contemplating a bill to legalise the colour bar not only by refusing certificates of proficiency to natives and Asiatics in specified provinces but by making "regulations to limit certain classes of work to and impose duties and obligations on persons other than natives and Asiatics". How far the scope of such a bill will extend can be known only after the actual provisions of the bill are published. But the object of the bill is clear enough. The coloured man in South Africa has not merely to suffer the indigmity of segregation but to allow himself to be pushed out of certain trades and occupation which will be limited to men of the white race. We doubt not only that once the bill is passed the Indians in the colony will find many of their occupations gone for the economic competition of the Indian is among the major reasons for the whites' hatred of him. The sufferings of our countrymen will then be full to the bursting point. What does the Government of India propose to do in respect of the Bill.?

Feb.13.1925.

## RIGHT OR CONCESSION.

The cat has come out of the bag. The Government of India are not convinced as statemd by Mr. Graham yesterday in the Legislative Assembly that Indi an in Tanganyika have got a clear case to go to the League of Nations with reference to the disabilities they are labouring under. This explains the protracted character of negotiations which commenced over two years ago, for it is not likely that if the Government do not feel that right is on their side, their representation would be distinguished by force and verve; in the circumstances it is not surprising that they consider that two years do not constitute a reasonable time for a settlement of the outstanding questions. The attitude of the Government indicated in the official speeches, gives support to the public feelings that it is sucidal to depend on the authorities to stand out boldly and courageously for the cause of our nationals. Tanganyika is a mandated territyr, entrusted to the care Germans. Indian form 90% of the traders there but they are being forced to maintain their accounnts in English or swatile though on the representation of France the few French merchants there have been allowed to write them in their own language. The reason is obvious. Frence is an independent country which knows how to get its right recognised while India is a subject country whose nationals can be ill-heated with impunity. Is this differentiation calculated to make India indulge in praise of the glory of the British Empire? Mr. Graham tought that the demand of Indians was not a right but a concession for perhaps four hundred languages were spoken by the members of the League and it would be impossible to recognise every language. This argument is extraordinarily stupid; the question is not what the languages of the members of the league are,

161 1950



but what is just and proper thing to do so far as the inhabitant in the mandated territory are concerned. The majority of merchants are Indians and they have a right to be allowed to write up their accounts in their own language . If that is not so, how did the handful of the French people secure what they wanted? Mr. Bhore based the opposition of the Government to the non-official resolutions asking that the delegates of case India to the Assembly of the League should be instructed to place the case of Indian in Tanganyika before te council on the more practical ground that everything possible was being done by the Government the colonial office, he pointed out had promised to direct that licenses should be granted to pedlars on payment of fees; further with regard to the language grievance the Britain Government has consented to postpone the coming into effect of the ordinance in regard to it the April 1926 and promised to reexamine the whole position we agree with Mr. Bhose that the Government of India have been very patient. Only the patience has been that of an unconvinced advocate not that of streneous fighter for a good cause. No wonder that Mr. Shanmukham chetty bluntly said that there was no good of negotiation when the Government of India thought that Indians had no strong case. In this connection it is rather surprising that no reference should have been made in the debate to the objectionable character of the new immigaration ordinance which it is feared by Indians would hit them hard. The Public in India is disguisted with the Knee crooking habits of the Government even in respect of matter on which they can well afford to stand up couragecusly. The Assembly has adopted the resolution but the authorities can treat it as a scrap of paper and even if they do not there is Mr. Graham's speech to discredit our case. The Assembly should be asked to elect India's representatives to the League otherwise there is every risk of India being misrepresented in this matter.

1952



162

March.31.1925.

INDIANSIN FIJI.

The exact position of Indians in Fiji to day is not known, of one thing however there is no doubt namely that their case despite all the rosy accounts that appear in the press is not all r ight. It may relatively better compared with conditions elsewhere or some years ago in Fiji itself but unless there is more evidence than is available we are not prepared to dogmatise that the Fiji Indians lack nothing whatever of the things of this world or of the world beyond. At least one observer whose bonafides we can not question. Mr. Mac Million of the Y.M.C.A. has it that the economic condition of the Indians in the colony at the present is far from ebing unsatisfactory. This conclusion can not in any case, be accepted without reservations; for Mr. Mac Million" conclusions are relative and based upon adverse conditions in some part of India at some particular time. The fact that in the last four years 1920-23 no less than 10,300 people returned to India from that colony does ot altogether support the rosy view that some are disposed to take of the state of affairs there. It is possible and we grant the decline in the number of repatriates in 1922 and in 1923 and their absence in 1924 suggest such a conclusion. That since 1923 conditions have relatively bettered but it is clear in any case that they could not have bettered to such an extent within the space of 12 months as to save us all anxiety on that score. Above all there are other aspects in regard to this matter which too have to be considered beyond the purely pecuniary one. What for instance are the political conditions in the colony? Do Indians stand to gain equality of rights there? If they do why

163 1954



is it that more than a sixth of the Indian population left the islands for good in the space of 4 years? These are questions which require an answer. We can only hope "the proposals" which Earl Winterton refers in reply to a question in the commons will be satisfactory on all these points.

- - - - -

April.6.1925.

LORD OLIVER ON "INDIAN DIFFICULTIES".

Lord Oliver's series of Articles on "Indian difficulties" the concluding three of which we publishe to day must be reckuned as a shrewed commentary an certain aspects of the Indian situation to day. We can not agree with some of his theories and when in regard to the facts of the Indian situations as they are understood by him we must hold that he has egregiously blundered in two or three cases. Making free alloweance for these it must be recognised that Lord Oliver's survey of the Indian situation to day is characterised by the understanding sympathy of a disinterested observer in the closest touch with the affairs of which he speaking His examination of the basis of British authority in India and of the events which have led to the present dis harmony between the rulers and the ruled bears the stamp of a critical cultured and discerning intellect which would penetrate behind the surface of things into the motives which move men of an alien race, and culture to action. He rules out force as the basis of British rule in India for to concede the force theory will be to justify successful revolt. Nor does he agree that that basis is to be found in the matually warring antagonisms of the different communities in India; for national states have been successfully brought out of such antagonism in the past. The trusteeship theory if any, obviously appeals to Lord Oliver with its implication that Britain should do every thing in her power to democratise Indian administration by way of "guiding, so far as non-representation Government can the trend of constitutional changes by which very diver[illegible] and potentially antagonistic class interests and obst[illegible] religious prejudices may be effected".

Oliver holds has not been appreciated in

165 1958



impbications. Many Englåshmen always and most Englishmen on occasions speak as though their interest in thair India was a properetory one. This outlook not a little colours the doings of the bureaucracy in India. It is the ruling race fallacy that has been responsible for some of the maxims to which Lord Oliver disapprovingly refers such as that the oriental understands no logic other than force and that to sacrifice prestige is to imperil administrative success. To that root fallacy, again should be traced the feeling that all agitation in favour of Home Rule is sedition and that to condemn Dyesism without clear reservations is to bid good bye to "the dominion in India"

Lord Oliver not only recognises the above facts but goes on vigoriously to explode the other Die hard fallacies that the masses and Muslims are at heart in favour of firm British rule and only wait for a firm and certain lead from Britain. Those who hung these fallacies to their bosom. Lord Oliver courageously points out really live in a Fool's paradise. Nor are Lord Oliver's criticisms in regard to the machinery of Government as distinguished from what may be called the peculiar psychology of the Britisher and the bureaucrat and the less penetrating Lord Oliver's observations on the defects of mixed constitutions echo the words of the Minority Report of the Muddiman Committee. In such constitutions the legislative is bound to be needless at variance with the Executive and the resultant deadlocks are calculated to increase neither the sense of responsibility of the legislature nor the readiness of the Executive to put itself in tune with the legislature. "The disheartening features of such a situation"., says Lord Oliver, "are curable only by the stress of responsibility"

166

1960



"Even when responsibility is granted", he goes on to add, "it must be a long time before, if ever it comes to be samely and reasonably interpreted even in the very imperfect degree that it is in our parliament." In the light of admissions like these we feel it unnecessary to examine Lord Oliver's criticisms of the "tactic" of the Swaraj party in adopting obstructions suffice it to say that in provinces where obstruction was not even though fo the working of Montford diarchy has not served to usher in a mittermum of even to pronote national advancement in any noticeable measure.

The fact iw that even Lord Oliver has not succeeeded in all respects in probing Indian malady to its depths. The philosophy of temperamental in compatibilities with which he seeks to explain the Gurukabah beating is at best a spperficial philosophy. It is not the case that while the English man worships law we worship religion. We respect law as march as any Englsihman where respect is due to it and history records many cases where the Englishman scouted the law to respect his xxx rights religion and conscience In all the latter cases the explanation has been that he disobeyed the law to obey the law. That explanation is available and valid as much to the Indian as to the Englishman. Lord Oliver is equally wrong when he says that what Mahatma Gandhi aims when he says that what at is a primitive peasant state and when in a superior manner, he lays down that democracy means the working of certain constitutional machinery which the use of the Charaka cannot provide. Mahatma Gandhi himself has given the lie direct to the former statement. As regards the latter we need only say that democracy involves something more than a constitutional machinery a severe sense of discipline in the

people constituting the democracy, a spirit of self sacrifice which will rate the community's interests higher than these of the lower self, a readiness to act in perfect union with others ~~toerhs~~ and a genuine anxiety to provide for the physical needs of the meanest of its members. Mahatma Gandhi believes that to make charaka success is to develop these qualities and demonstrate that the community possesses them. Lord Oliver has ~~tons~~ done nothing to challenge that belief Barring these mistaken views, Lord Oliver's survey of the situation in India must be reckoned a discerning performance. He is not obviously one of these who would postpone re-opening the question of further reforms till after 1929. If defects there are in the constitution and his observations on mixed constitutionals show what he thinks of it ~~xx~~ he says that action must be taken to remedy them. Failure to do so, he says can do nothing. "But aggravate distrust of our good faith". Unfortunately for us, the gulf between Lord Oliver's professions and performances have proved to be very wide. He has shown himself to be another "wisest fool in christendem". , in his generation. That fact i~~s~~ is that deprives India of any satisfaction which in other circumstances his essay may have given to this country.

<u>April.8.1925.</u>

## INDIAN PROPAGANDA IN ENGLAND.

In a special artilce to the ombay hronicle Mr. George Lansbury puts in a strong plea for Indian propaganda in England. "There need be no doubt all", he says, " as to what the British people will do once they understand". speaking for himself Mr. Lansbury says:-

I am in favour of and would give support to every effort made on behlaf of true Home Rule for India. he Montague hemsford Reforms should be scrappled at should ~~Thee~~. Diarchy has failed further full and complete powers should be given to the local legislatures. At the centre Indi an opinion should be called in and all the rights of the ~~##~~ Viceroy to certify legislation over the heads of elected representatives should be abolished. The amount of money spent on the army should be reduced so that much more should be spent on education and other social services. India herself should raise her own defensive forces and organise them. The uniquitious Sat tax which is a tax on food should be either abolished done now if only goodwill on both sides is allowed to have its way but goodwill without deeds is useless: "show me thy works" says the palmist, " and I will show you your faith". Let us remember we live in deeds not words.

Mr. Lansbury obviously writes from the socialist's point of view. What he wants to know is what the people of India want. He is for "true co-operation between two great nations." To that end he says "British Trade Union Movement

169.

1966



must help our Indian brothers". and the latter in return must educate the former as to what they want. He writes the note to The Chronicle in hope he says, "that India will have patience with our ignorance and faith in our goddwi that she will send her gifted sons to this country to give us knowledge of what she wants". Great as may be the benefits of a revivified trade union movement in India we must say that to treat it on a par with the national movement is to betray ignorance of India conditions Mr. Lansbury seems to forget that the organised labour of India constitutes less than 10% of the total population.

- - - - -

May.18.1925.

THE "TRUSTEE IN KENYA.

The Government of India declared in a despatch to the British Government that whatever may be the situation in the Self Governing dominions there was no justification in colonies directly administered by His Majesty's Government for treating Indians differently from British immigrants. Their statement was accepted by the Imperial Conference infirentially because of the adoption by it of the equality resolution but the colonies where this differntiation existed at the time continue to follow the old policy of pen-pricks without so much as a protest from these above. The trouble in Kenya for instance is as sevre ever and the major grievances of Indians still remain unremindied,. The white settlers have got the infamous white paper on their side and all endeavours to make any departure from it are meeting with streneous opposition from them. Meanwhile the Government of India are advancing backwards and propose to send an officer to Kenya to report on the suitability of the lowlands for Indian Settlement and this betray on cause by seeking to accept the terms of that impossible settlement. The fact seems to be that the authorities are trusting to time to make India forget the insult and accept the humiliating decision. But projects are being matured in order to render exploitation by the European easy and the Ormsbygore commission's report. a summary of which is published elsewhere is designed to fascilitate the economic hold of the colony by the white settleer The report is not likely in view of the antecedents of Major ormsby Gore to permit the open exploitation of natives of Kenya but the willy capitalists will have no difficulty

12.7.56 171 1970



in out manwring the attempt to see that justice is done to the indigeneous pepulation. Even the indirect references to the problem are resenteed by the settlers who are determined to crush out all opposition to their policy of exploitation; The Democrat of Nanobi reprinted the other day an article from a paper in South Africa dealing historically with the treatment meted out to natives of Kenya by successive immigrants if ~~ma~~ anything, the reference to British occupiers was complementary. But the settlers got alarmed best such republication should put ideas of equality and liberty into the minds of the labouring pepulation and a member asked the Government in the Legislative Council whether such statements as "the whole history of European colonisation in Afriaa is written with the blood of native population were going to be quietily allowed to be diseminated" in the interests of the natives" The Government replied that "in the interest of natives they were considering what steps they should take and Lord Delamere withdraw a motion on the subject of which he had given notice on the understanding that the paper would be proceeded against. The resolution wanted that The Democrat which published articles " want only creating unrest" should be immediately punished and that the law should be strengthened if it was not effective for the purpose. It is notorious that the definite object of the Kenya Government is to foster development of the colour whatever may be the result of such a policy on the indigenous population for only recently the acting Government stated that the Government" expected every administrative officer to give an possible encouragement to the labour within his district to work on the lands which have been opened up by the settlers", for it was unthinkable that Government could contemplate the efforts of settlers being rendered

useless for want of labour". It is really a great comfort to know on the authority of a correspondent who writes to The New Statesman the article will be found elsewhere that the young officers who now go out to Kenya are imbued with other and more humanitarian ideas about the natives. It seems that the members of the European convention are frantic about recruits coming from the Universities" who are a menace to the prestige of the whites" ; they are inspired by anti-white ideas and Bolshevist tendencies" and influenced by socialistic all men equal brotherhood of man views, they become "unbalanced and erratic in their actions". Almost the first good news we hear from Kenya is the change which is coming over the attitude of the young officers; one hopes that their contact with seasoned enemies of Indians and natives would not corrupt them and make them callons.

173
1974



May.18.1925.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The round table conference idea to settle the South African Indian question which has been so much favoured by the Government of India has apparently been seized with greater enthusiasm precisely by these to whom it was least suspected it would appeal. Surprising as it may seem it has found favour among the most violent of anti-Asiatic whites Councillor H.H. Kemp the leader of anti-Asiatic movement in Natal, for instance likes the idea so much that he has moved the Durban Town Council to adopt a resolution recommending to the Government of the Union of south Africa that that Government and the union parliament should take " "such steps as may be necessary for convening such a conference in this country without delay". The proposal has met with a certain measure of very qualified almost heroic support among a section of Indians in the Dominion but the qualifications are so vital that their acceptance does not mean much. We are not surprised at the peculiar receiption the proposal has received at the hands of the Indi ans. The latter point out that India has an international stauts through her membership of the League of Nations and that the Indian States are sovereign states in the eye of international law; "If England still remains indifferent to exercise her Soverign power which she is bound to by all moral and internationa laws to vindicate the rights of unrepresented British Subjects in South Africa thoughthe latter may enjoy Dominion status", writes. The African Chronicle", a contingency may arise when England allies among Indian potentites may revise

their outlook and take such steps as may be necessary to safeguard the rights and honour of their nationals". The paper goes on to invite the whites to shape their policy "in accordance with the professed principles which the Empire has proclaimed to the world" It is neteworthy that these are comments accepting the round table conference idea of Mr. Kemp and suggesting the way in which the Conference idea of Mr. Kemp and suggesting should solve the issue! Whoever may have called for a confernece to work on these lines it was surely not councillor Kemp. That is worthy wants the conference not to do justice to Indians but to point out ways as to how best the whites might get rid of the Indians. Councillor Kemp makes it clear that he does not surrender "one job or little or my beleif as to the form of relief which only will be acceptable to European Natal and the Union in the matter of the solution of the Asiatic question". What he is anxious about is only "that the method of arriving at that relief shall be the correct one" Councillor Kemp does not evidently intend the Conferenece to be an impartial tribunal; it is just to be an effective meachinary meant to help south Africa in successfully administering her "white supremacy "and "Anti-Asiatic" policy ? In these circumstances when incompatible objectives are envisaged as the work of the conference how can India accept the round table conference idea?

- - - -

175

1978



June2.1925.

## THE COLOUR BAR IN AFRICA.

The debate in the South African Assembly on the Second reading of the colour Bar Bill is important and in a sense epoch making for the revelations it gives of the rising tide of racialism in the union and the determination of the party in power to give no quarter to the coloured people in the colony. The white man's point of view was well voiced by Mr. J.J. Pioneer (Pienaar) when in the course of the debate he said: "The danger that threatened the white population which founded greater difficulty in obtaining work was increasing and something must be done to counteract it. Natives were being educated and there was a grave danger of industries becoming black" The Minister of Maines Mr. Beyers, also took the same stand point in replying to the debate when he said "for 14 years hon'ble members opposite(d) and their party have ruled the destinies of this country and I say deliberately they have systematically run away from the handling of this problem of the future of the white man. Were they going to country burying their heads in the sand like ostitches? In the camp alone the Native vote in a comparatively few years would be able to swamp the Europeans at the toll and he urged that it was upto them to deal with that potentiality otherwise the position of white civilisation would he hopeless and past redemption" Thus the position of the Herzog Government with regard to the whole question is clear unequivocal and beyond misunderstanding. It is an open war against the natives and the Asiatics in order to preserve the worst form of white race supremacy. To view it in any other light is

176

1980



is but a deliberate [refusal] to see the facts as they really are. The Government and the people of India along with "The natives of Africa can gain nothing by "burying their heads ostrich like" to borrow the expression used by the Minister of Mines. That the negroes have clearly realised the danger is evident from the speeches of their spokesman in the Assembly as also from the messages that the several African Associations in the colony sent to the House on the day of the debate denouncing the Bill in the strongest terms and threatening ceaseless agitation if it were passed. They realise that it is only because of the ~~xxxx~~ colour of their skin and race that they are deliberately kept under not allowed to rise to the full status of their citizenship and humanity. They are therefore determined as Major Ballantive warned the House "not to take the insult lying down". "On the other hand" he declared," the natives would organise and cause stagnation in the industries of the country". Judging by the apathy in this country it would appear that Indians alone have not yet awakened to a full sense of gravity of the situation that threatens our countryman in the colony. From a letter of Mr. J.Royeppen, Bar-at-Law, appearing in an issue of The African Chronicle deploring the prevailing inertia and listlessness of the rank and file of the Indians in South Africa and warming them of the beginning of their end in the African contenent we have reason to fear that the same depression and indifference that is now visible in Indian politics and public life has also infected the minds of our brethern abroad.

It would thus appear that racialism and reaction is in the ascendment in the vast sub-continent which forms no ~~xxxx~~ insignificant part of the British Empire threatening

all hopes of racial reconcilliation and equality with in the bounds of the commonwealth. But the attitude of the members of the opposition in the union Assembly led by General Statements forms a suducing though not quite reassuring element in the situation, some of their speeches display a spirit of fairness and justice towards the Natives and a love of human brother hood and racial unity which auger well for the failure of peace. Mr. Gilson described the effect of the policy in the following terms: "Instead of helping the Nature to rise, they were forcing him deeper and deeper in the mere and drawing him back to the wall. There were abroad to day subversive influnces such as Bolshevism and if the Government "continued" to deny the Nature his rights. He would hurn to those subversive influences which would only be too glad to get hold of him. Had the Government ever considered what might happen of five million natives were driven into a state of desperation?" The reply of the Minister of Mines, already referred to does not indicate that this question has gone home into the minds of the offical benches. It should be the task of Indians as also the Government of India to take steps along with the coloured people in the colony to make the authorities of the union realise the fully of their perpetuating the colour bar in the statute book and this throwing overboard the new concept of the Empire which Mr. Baldwin spoke of in his recently delivered Empire day message. Will the Government of India or the Imperial cabinet which is the trustee of the backward races, respend to the call and rise equal to the occasion?

178 1984



July.22.1925.

## INDIAN IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. Malan's announcement in the South African Assembly of his intention to introduce a segregation Bill simply means that the Hertzog Government propose to revive the class Areas Bill which the smits Government introduced in the South African Parliament last your but which lapsed owing to the dessolution of parliament before its passage. The objects of the measure which Mr. Malan now threatens us with are identical with these underlying Mr. Dunican's class Areas Bill. The latter Bill it may be recalled was "a Bill to make provision for the reservation of residential and trading areas in Urban areas ofr persons other than natives having racial characteristics in Common." The Bill which Hertzog Government contemplates has identically the same objects in view. It enables any urban area to apply for the segregation of Asiatics. The Bill enables the Government to segregate all the domiciled Indians alike for residence and trade. As Mahatma Gandhi stated, while commenting on that Bill" segregation carried out to the all face means nothing less than compulsory repatriation without any compensation". The smits Smuts Government's Bill failed to become laid simply because of an accidental circumstance. The Hertzog Government has revived the Bill. It is a clear challenge to India a repudiation of the Solemn promise made to her under the smits Smuts Gandhi Agreement that all the then existing vested interests of Indians would be preserved and constrictively a campaign of virtual extermination against the Asiatics. What is India's answer going to be to this renewed offensive?

- - - -

179. 1986



August.11.1925.

MAURITIUS

## INDIANS IN MANITISS.

Summary:- The report of Mr. Kunwar Maharaj Singh who was deputed to Mansitius (Mauritius) to ~~mmx~~ unquire into the question of the emigration of Indians into the colony is simmarised elsewhere. The recommendations throw light an the present condition of our countrymen in the colony and urge the need for making better arrangements for them in regard to housing medical relief, compensation for accidents and prohibition of children's labour and the drink evil. The deputation it will be remembered was sent out at the instance of the Manistuis (Mauritius) Government whose representaties of Mr. Singh therefore that further emigration of unskilled labour from this country is unnecessary and undesirable deserves the serious consideration of the Government we need hardly add that immediate steps should also be taken to see that the proposals for the betterment of the condition of our brethren in the colony suggested by Mr. Singh are carred out without delay by the colonial authorities.

- - - - -

August.15.1925.

A SCANDAL-FROM THE MADRAS MAIL.

The Madras Mail's adventures in the firled of political psychology are as remarkable for their insight as for their in falliability. With the unerring instinct of a certain patent medicine it always "towards the spot". The latest exhibition of its powers of divination, which make of Ithuriel a back mumber is the discovery that the swarajists are out for red riot and revolution. The manner of the discovery is peculiar. Mr. Goswami passed through Madras yesterday en his way back to england. A representative of The Madras Mail went to interview him but Mr. Goswami prefered to say nothing till he had studied conditions in India. On this slender basis The Madras Mail has built up an elaborate supersturcture of gratitutions warnin to the local electors as to what they are biting themselves in for in supporting the swarajist candidates. Mr. Goswami makes it amply clear that our contemporary's ingenuity has ridiculously over reached itself and that if it wanted political capital it ought to have chosen a more promising subject than a refused interview of a less pugnacious politician than its intended victim. If our contemporary does not wit under the withening contempt of Mr. Goswami's sareasm it must be more dead to feelings of deemey than even the generality of the Anglo Indian Press.If it was in search of d ramatic revelations on the eve of the elections it might have found an illunination object lesson in the constitutional methods of the Justice party as depicted in the incidents of Thursday night at Tondiarpet;. A revolt in the hand is worth many revelutions in the bush.

- - - -

181.

1990



August.20.1925.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The studied silence of the Government of India in regard to the Asiatic question in South Africa is we find worrying even Anglo-Indian papers. The Times of India refers to the impression which would be produced in Great Britain and union by this attitude and asks the viceroy to make a statement as to how it is that the Government have not been able to stem the tide of anti-Indian legislation. The reason is partly because the Indian Government have not egen the courage to speak out boldly on behalf of the persecuted Indians. With a collousness which is characteristic of an alien Government they remain satisfied with sending despatches which are only thrown on the scyrap heap. Gen Hertzog will only care to negotiate with a Government which sets some store by its our self respect. But he knows that the viceroy is afraid not only of utilising the Reciprocity Act but of courageously standing up for the cause entrusted to him our contemporary closes with the following appeal.

We hope Government will take an early opportunity to make a statement on these points butx if they do not we look to the Bombay and Madras Members whose compatriots most of South Africans Indians are to bring pressure to bear upon and if possible to reiterate the determination of these provinces wtih or without the help of the rest of India, to support by advice by money and by every other available means the claim of South African Indians mkto the rights of decent citisehhhip and then efforts to assert it.

India is bound to do what lies in her power to to help the community in South Africa. But the tragedy of the situation is that her Govmrnment has proved to be a broken seed: reed.

182

1992



August 29.1925.

INDIANS IN NATAL.

Summary. The Durban correspondent of the Pioneer referring to the restrictions proposed to be placed on the Indian community in regard to the ownership of real property in Natal freehold or leasehold says that they would be unacceptable to responsible public opinion in South Africa. It will be something if it is so. He further points out.

The provision undoubtedly seems to have been devised to give effect to the idea expressed by Dr. Malan in moving the first reading of the Bill that "no solution would be acceptable to the country unless it brought about a very considerable reduction in the Indian population".

The object of the whole Bill is to drive out the Indi ans every provision has been framed with a view to achive this end.

- - - - - - - -

1853

30

1994

Sept.7.1925.

IMMIGRATION TO KENYA.

That attempts are being made to make out a case for the restriction or prohibition of Indian immigration into Kenya is clear from the motion adopted by the Legislative Council for taking a fresh census of the population, though are was take in 1921 and another would be taken in 1931. The real object is to show that Indians are so large in number as to affect the economic position of natives. One Mr. O'shea speaking on the motion, blurted out the truth when he said:

It was also important know how many Indians there were in the country. It had been laid down time after time that in the interests of native development Indians were engaged in a class of work that could definite policy that the native was to be ederated to take his place in performing much of the work that was at present being done by an alien population. Therefore it was important that the Government should know to how many Indians there were in the country. Again in regard to the white papper they had been told that an immigration law would be introduced to control immigration. That promise had not been kept because they had been unable to prove that the immigration of Indians was larger than was desirable. They wanted to get at the facts of the case.

The Indians in the council tried in vain to persuade their colleagues to reject the motion because it was really conceived against Indians but they were in a glorious minority of them.

- - - -

Sept.21.1925

CONGRESS COMMITTEE.

To morrow's meeting of the All-India Congress Committee at Patna will decide questions of vital importance to the country. We feel no doubt that a full sense of realities and freedom from prepossessions will be bought to bear on the discussions, for there has been lately a remarkable change in the outlook of members of different political forces to the extent at least of promoting the common object It would be a collossal blunder if at such a juncture, when the Government have thrown out a challenge to the peopel we should fitter away our energies on comparatively unimportant issus and fail to concentrate all our powers and resources on securing Swaraj. The Committee has a grave responsibility to discharge and it can discharge it satisfactorily only by rendering united action easier than it is at present. The Congress is the only body which after all that is said in disparagement of it by friends and foes. Still captivates Indian mind and is widely revered and respected. Its platform should be made wider and under its name should political agitation be carried. No work could be more urgent or important than that of strengthening it and enabling it to speak and act for the whole country.

- - - -

Sept.25.1925.

PROTEST MEETINGS.

The All India Congress Committee has fixed the 11th October for Public meetings of all parties all over the country to protest against the treatment meted out to Indians the South Africa. We hope this call for a nation wide protest will be heartily responded to by all sections of the public so as to show to the Government of India and the authorities in South Africa that the whole strength of the nation will be mobilised in Support of her children, overseas in their present life and death struggle. The committee has clearly pronounced the proposed anti-Asiatic legislation as a breach of the settlement of 1914 and declared that the country should not become a party to any scheme of repatriation whether described as voluntary or compulsory. In this connection it is necessary to warn the public against the game that the South African correspondents of our Anglo-Indian contemporaries have already begun to play of white washing the provisions of the Black Bill and misleading the Indian public to take the view that Asiatic Bill only aims to put into the form of a statute what is already an unwritten law in the Union and that the Indian settlers stand to gain in some important respects by the proposed legislation. Certain observation of the Capetwon correspondent of The Times of India furnish a sample of this propaganda. He writes:

Already in many town in the North certain trading streets and residential parts are chiefly occupied by Indians who naturally flock together as to the Europeans. All then that the segregation provision of the Bill will do is to make what is now an unwritten rule with plenty of exceptions a written rule with practically no exceptions.

33 186 2000

-4-

Thus in actual practice this segregation however obnosious in principle will not create any considerable hardship especially as vested rights are fully protected the Bill applying only to new trading licenses new bases and new sales of prosperity.

It is mysterious how these blessings which the Bill showers on the Indian community according to the correspondent are not perceptible to our countrymen in the colony. The correspondent it will be noticed opines that the Bill does not afford any solution of the problem of what the Europeans call the Unfair competition of the Indian in trade. If this is true the Bill loses even the little justification that would otherwise exist for its adoption by the union parliament.

- - -

17/5/2013 | RI/RH
©
©
17/5/2013 | RI/RH
22/3/16 | RH/RI